

# The Social Background of the Reformation

PRESERVED SMITH



Book II of this two-volume edition of *The Age of the Reformation*.  
Each book may be read as an independent work in itself.



"The Spanish ambassador Enriquez de Toledo was in Rome calling on Imperia de Cugnatis, a lady who, though of the demimonde, lived like a princess, cultivated letters and art, and had many poets as well as many nobles among her friends. Her floors were carpeted with velvet rugs, her walls hung with golden cloth and her tables loaded with costly bric-à-brac. The Spanish courtier suddenly turned and spat copiously in the face of his lackey and then explained to the slightly startled company that he chose this objective rather than soil the splendor he saw around him."

—from Chapter 1, *Social Conditions*

PRESERVED SMITH

# THE SOCIAL OF THE





# BACKGROUND REFORMATION

**COLLIER BOOKS**  
**NEW YORK, N.Y.**

This Collier Books edition is published by arrangement with Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Collier Books is a division of The Crowell-Collier Publishing Company

First Collier Books Edition 1962

This title previously appeared as part 2 of THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

Copyright, 1920 by Henry Holt and Co.

All Rights Reserved

Hecho en los E.E.U.U.

Printed in the United States of America

VITA  
CARIORI  
FILIOLAE  
PRISCILLAE  
SACRUM



## Foreword

PRESERVED SMITH was consciously writing of an age rather than of a religion when he wrote and titled *The Age of the Reformation*; for him the religious revolution was only one of its characteristics. The Collier Books edition of this nearly classic work, dividing it into two parts for the convenience of the reader, follows exactly the author's original. Thus this second volume, *The Social Background of the Reformation*, is Smith's brilliant study of the institutions, the life of the people, and the developing intellectual climate of absorbing times.

Few historians have had a greater gift for synthesis. While the revolution of thought, theology, and torment which was the Reformation took seed and sprouted, life in the countries of western Europe went on. The middle ages, Smith summarizes succinctly, had no wealth, but only degrees of poverty. Then a steadily increasing commerce, a money economy, and the resources of a new world combined in a cataclysmic change. As the control of the church slackened, monarchy and nationalism were waiting in the wings. Cruelty was perhaps the dominant fact of life: the cruelty of parents to children, of upper class to servant, of state to prisoner, of all society to the lunatic; in a word, of man to man.

Yet Bayard and Sidney became bywords of chivalry, and Castiglione put the ideal of courtesy into print. Education, particularly under the impetus of printing, broke out from religious monopoly; and if the vernacular drove the classics from the field, still it opened the world of the intellect to increasing numbers. Modern tolerance arose not only from the ashes of Renaissance rationalism but from the mutual exhaustion of mass persecutions.

The heights of art in Italy or literature in England; the imagination that crossed uncharted seas; the science of Leonardo and Vives and Copernicus that remade reality—all these indicated an age as sublime as it was crude; and its aspirations won out over its fears.

The final section of Smith's history is a classification of

interpretations of the Reformation. For, just as the Reformation itself did not spring full blown from the brain of Luther, so it does not exist for the modern reader apart from the traditions and interpretations of ensuing centuries. To know the Reformation must mean also to know what it has meant to changing generations.

The interpretation of Preserved Smith will be outdated, too; in some minor respects it is so now. But because it engulfs the reader in the life of the times so that he can react, at least in part, to the Reformation as a man from whose turmoil it sprang, his study has passed its first generation of use and has begun to meet the test of enduring value.



# Contents

Preface	11
1 Social Conditions	15
1 Population. 2 Wealth and Prices. Increase of wealth in modern times. Prices and wages in the Sixteenth Century. Value of money. Trend of prices. 3 Institutions. The monarchy, the Council of state, the Parliament. Public finance. Maintenance of Order. Sumptuary laws and "blue laws." The army. The navy. 4 Private life and manners. The nobility; the professions; the clergy. The city, the house, dress, food, drink. Sports. Manners. Morals. Position of Women. Health.	
2 The Capitalistic Revolution	69
1 The Rise of the Power of Money. Rise of capitalism. Banking. Mining. Commerce. Manufacture. Agriculture. 2 The Rise of the Money Power. Ascendancy of the bourgeoisie over the nobility, clergy, and proletariat. Class wars. Regulation of Labor. Pauperism.	
3 Main Currents of Thought	109
1 Biblical and classical scholarship. Greek and Hebrew Bibles. Translations. The classics. The vernaculars. 2 History. Humanistic history and church history. 3 Political theory. The state as power: Machiavelli. Constitutional liberty: Erasmus, Luther, Calvin, Hotman, Mornay, Bodin, Buchanan. Radicals: the <i>Utopia</i> . 4 Science. Inductive method. Mathematics. Zoölogy. Anatomy. Physics. Geography. Astronomy; Copernicus. Reform of the calendar. 5 Philosophy. The Catholic and Protestant thinkers. Skeptics. Effect of the Copernican theory: Bruno.	
4 The Temper of the Times	174
1 Tolerance and Intolerance. Effect of the Renaissance and Reformation. 2 Witchcraft. Causes of the mania. Protests against it. 3 Education. Schools. Effect of the Reformation. Universities. 4 Art. The ideals expressed. Painting. Architecture. Music. Effect of the Reformation and Counter-reformation. 5 Books. Number of books. Typical themes. Greatness of the Sixteenth Century.	



5	The Reformation Interpreted	223
1	The Religious and Political Interpretations. Burnet, Bos-	
	suet, Sleidan, Sarpi.	
2	The Rationalist Critique. Montes-	
	quieu, Voltaire, Robertson, Hume, Gibbon, Goethe, Lessing.	
3	The Liberal-Romantic Appreciation. Heine, Michelet,	
	Froude, Hegel, Ranke, Buckle.	
4	The Economic and	
	Evolutionary Interpretations. Marx, Lamprecht, Berger,	
	Weber, Nietzsche, Troeltsch, Santayana, Harnack, Beard,	
	Janssen, Pastor, Acton.	
5	Concluding Estimate.	

Bibliography	267
--------------	-----

Index	312
-------	-----

## Preface

THE EXCUSE for writing another history of the Reformation is the need for putting that movement in its proper relations to the economic and intellectual revolutions of the sixteenth century. The labor of love necessary for the accomplishment of this task has employed most of my leisure for the last six years and has been my companion through vicissitudes of sorrow and of joy. A large part of the pleasure derived from the task has come from association with friends who have generously put their time and thought at my disposal. First of all, Professor Charles H. Haskins, of Harvard, having read the whole in manuscript and in proof with care, has thus given me the unstinted benefit of his deep learning, and of his ripe and sane judgment. Next to him the book owes most to my kind friend, the Rev. Professor William Walker Rockwell, of Union Seminary, who has added to the many other favors he has done me a careful revision of Chapters 1<sup>1</sup> to 8, Chapter 14,<sup>2</sup> and a part of Chapter 9. Though unknown to me personally, the Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, of the Catholic University of Washington, consented, with gracious, characteristic urbanity, to read Chapters 6 and 8 and a part of Chapter 1. I am grateful to Professor N. S. B. Gras, of the University of Minnesota, for reading that part of the book directly concerned with economics (Chapter 11<sup>3</sup> and a part of Chapter 10<sup>4</sup>); and to Professor Frederick A. Saunders, of Harvard, for a like service in technical revision of the section on science in Chapter 12.<sup>5</sup> While acknowledging with hearty thanks the priceless services of these eminent scholars, it is only fair to relieve them of all responsibility for any rash statements that may have escaped their scrutiny, as well as for any conclusions from which they might dissent.

<sup>1</sup> Chapters 1 through 9 comprise the first volume of the Collier Books two-volume edition of *The Age of the Reformation* entitled *The Reformation in Europe*.

<sup>2</sup> Chapter 5 in this volume.

<sup>3</sup> Chapter 2.

<sup>4</sup> Chapter 1.

<sup>5</sup> Chapter 3.

For information about manuscripts and rare books in Europe my thanks are due to my kind friends: Mr. P. S. Allen, Librarian of Merton College, Oxford, the so successful editor of Erasmus's Epistles; and Professor Carrington Lancaster, of Johns Hopkins University. To several libraries I owe much for the use of books. My friend, Professor Robert S. Fletcher, Librarian of Amherst College, has often sent me volumes from that excellent store of books. My sister, Professor Winifred Smith, of Vassar College, has added to many loving services, this: that during my four years at Poughkeepsie, I was enabled to use the Vassar library. For her good offices, as well as for the kindness of the librarian, Miss Amy Reed, my thanks. My father, the Rev. Dr. Henry Preserved Smith, professor and librarian at Union Theological Seminary, has often sent me rare books from that library; nor can I mention this, the least of his favors, without adding that I owe to him much both of the inspiration to follow and of the means to pursue a scholar's career. My thanks are also due to the libraries of Columbia and Cornell for the use of books. But the work could not easily have been done at all without the facilities offered by the Harvard Library. When I came to Cambridge to enjoy the riches of this storehouse, I found the great university not less hospitable to the stranger within her gates than she is prolific in great sons. After I was already deep in debt to the librarian, Mr. W. C. Lane, and to many of the professors, a short period in the service of Harvard, as a lecturer in history, has made me feel that I am no longer a stranger, but that I can count myself, in some sort, one of her citizens and foster sons, at least a *dimidiatus alumnus*.

This book owes more to my wife than even she perhaps quite realizes. Not only has it been her study, since our marriage, to give me freedom for my work, but her literary advice, founded on her own experience as writer and critic, has been of the highest value, and she has carefully read the proofs.

PRESERVED SMITH.

Cambridge, Massachusetts, May 16, 1920.

## The Social Background of the Reformation



# Chapter 1

## Social Conditions

### § 1. Population

POLITICAL HISTORY is that of the state; economic and intellectual history that of a different group. In modern times this group includes all civilized nations. Even in political history there are many striking parallels, but in social development and in culture the recent evolution of civilized peoples has been nearly identical. This fundamental unity of the nations has grown stronger with the centuries on account of improving methods of transport and communication. Formally it might seem that in the Middle Ages the white nations were more closely bound together than they are now. They had one church, a nearly identical jurisprudence, one great literature and one language for the educated classes; they even inherited from Rome the ideal of a single world-state. But if the growth of national pride, the division of the church and the rise of modern languages and literatures have been centrifugal forces, they have been outweighed by the advent of new influences tending to bind all peoples together. The place of a single church is taken by a common point of view, the scientific; the place of Latin as a medium of learning has been taken by English, French, and German, each one more widely known to those to whom it is not native now than ever was Latin in the earlier centuries. The fruits of discovery are common to all nations, who now live under similar conditions, reading the same books and (under different names) the same newspapers, doing the same business and enjoying the same luxuries in the same manner. Even in matters of government we are visibly approaching the perhaps distant but apparently certain goal of a single world-state.

In estimating the economic and cultural conditions of the sixteenth century it is therefore desirable to treat Western

Europe as a whole. One of the marked differences between all countries then and now is in population. No simple law has been discovered as to the causes of the fluctuations in the numbers of the people within a given territory. This varies with the wealth of the territory, but not in direct ratio to it; for it can be shown that the wealth of Europe in the last four hundred years has increased vastly more than its population. Nor can it be discovered to vary directly in proportion to the combined amount and distribution of wealth, for in sixteenth-century England while the number of the people was increasing wealth was being concentrated in fewer hands almost as fast as it was being created. It is obvious that sanitation and transportation have a good deal to do with the population of certain areas. The largest cities of our own times could not have existed in the Middle Ages, for they could not have been provisioned, nor have been kept enduringly healthy without elaborate aqueducts and drains.

Other more obscure factors enter in to complicate the problems of population. Some nations, like Spain in the sixteenth and Ireland in the nineteenth century, have lost immensely through emigration. The cause of this was doubtless not that the nation in question was growing absolutely poorer, but that the increase of wealth or in accessibility to richer lands made it relatively poorer. It is obvious again that great visitations like pestilence or war diminish population directly, though the effect of such factors is usually temporary. How much voluntary sterility operates is problematical. Aegidius Albertinus, writing in 1602, attributed the growth in population of Protestant countries since the Reformation to the abolition of sacerdotal celibacy, and this has also been mentioned as a cause by a recent writer. Probably the last named forces have a very slight influence; the primary one being, as Malthus stated, the increase of means of subsistence.

As censuses were almost unknown to sixteenth-century Europe outside of a few Italian cities, the student is forced to rely for his data on various other calculations, in some cases tolerably reliable, in others deplorably deficient. The best of these are the enumerations of hearths made for purposes of taxation in several countries. Other counts were



sometimes made for fiscal or military, and occasionally for religious, purposes. Estimates by contemporary observers supplement our knowledge, which may be taken as at least approximately correct.

The religious census of 1603 gave the number of communicants in England and Wales as 2,275,000, to which must be added 8475 recusants. Adding 50 per cent. for non-communicants, we arrive at the figure of 3,425,000, which is doubtless too low. Another calculation based on a record of births and deaths yields the figure 4,812,000 for the year 1600. The average, 4,100,000, is probably nearly correct, of which about a tenth in Wales. England had grown considerably during the century, this increase being especially remarkable in the large towns. Whereas, in 1534, 150,000 quarters of wheat were consumed in London annually, the figure for 1605 is 500,000. The population in the same time had probably increased from 60,000 to 225,000. No figures worth anything can be given for Ireland, and for Scotland it is only safe to say that in 1500 the population was about 500,000 and in 1600 about 700,000.

Enumerations of hearths and of communicants give good bases for reckoning the population of the Netherlands. Holland, the largest of the Northern provinces, had about 200,000 people in 1514; Brabant, the greatest of the Southern, in 1526 had 500,000. The population of the largest town, Antwerp, in 1526 was 88,000, in 1550 about 110,000. At the same time it is remarkable that in 1521 Ghent impressed Dürer as the greatest city he had seen in the Low Countries. For the whole territory of the Netherlands, including Holland and Belgium, and a little more on the borders, the population was in 1560 about 3,000,000. This is the same figure as that given for 1567 by Lewis Guicciardini. Later in the century the country suffered by war and emigration.

The lack of a unified government, and the great diversity of conditions, makes the population of Germany more difficult to estimate. Brandenburg, having in 1535 an area of 10,000 square miles, and a population between 300,000 and 400,000, has been aptly compared for size and numbers to the present state of Vermont. Bavaria had in 1554 a popula-

tion of 434,000; in 1596 of 468,000. Würzburg had in 1538 only 12,000; Hamburg in 1521 12,000 and in 1594 19,000. Danzig had in 1550 about 21,000. The largest city in central Germany, if not in the whole country—as a chronicler stated in 1572—was Erfurt, with a population of 32,000 in 1505. It was the center of the rising Saxon industries, mining and dying, and of commerce. Lübeck, Cologne, Nuremberg and Augsburg equalled or perhaps surpassed it in size, and certainly in wealth. The total population of German Switzerland was over 200,000. The whole German-speaking population of Central Europe amounted to perhaps twenty millions in 1600, though it had been reckoned by the imperial government in 1500 as twelve millions.

The number of Frenchmen did not greatly increase in France in the 16th century. Though the borders of the state were extended, she suffered terribly by religious wars, and somewhat by emigration. Not only did many Huguenots flee from her to Switzerland, the Netherlands and England, but economic reasons led to large movements from the south and perhaps from the north. To fill up the gap caused by emigration from Spain a considerable number of French peasants moved to that land; and it is also possible that the same class of people sought new homes in Burgundy and Savoy to escape the pressure of taxes and dues. Various estimates concur in giving France a population of 15,000,000 to 16,000,000. The Paris of Henry II was by far the largest city in the world, numbering perhaps 300,000; but when Henry IV besieged it it had been reduced by war to 220,000. After that it waxed mightily again.

Italy, leader in many ways, was the first to take accurate statistics of population, births and deaths. These begin by the middle of the fifteenth century, but are rare until the middle of the sixteenth, when they become frequent. Notwithstanding war and pestilence the numbers of inhabitants seemed to grow steadily, the apparent result in the statistics being perhaps in part due to the increasing rigor of the census. Herewith follow specimens of the extant figures: The city of Brescia had 65,000 in 1505, and 43,000 in 1548. During the same period, however, the people in her

whole territory of 2200 square miles had increased from 303,000 to 342,000. The city of Verona had 27,000 in 1473 and 52,000 in 1548; her land of 1200 square miles had in the first named year 99,000, in the last 159,000. The kingdom of Sicily grew from 600,000 in 1501 to 800,000 in 1548, and 1,180,000 in 1615. The kingdom of Naples, without the capital, had about 1,270,000 people in 1501; 2,110,000 in 1545; the total including the capital amounted in 1600 to 3,000,000. The republic of Venice increased from 1,650,000 in 1550 to 1,850,000 in 1620. Florence with her territory had 586,000 in 1551 and 649,000 in 1622. In the year 1600 Milan with Lombardy had 1,350,000 inhabitants; Savoy in Italy 800,000; continental Genoa 500,000; Parma, Piacenza and Modena together 500,000; Sardinia 300,000; Corsica 150,000; Malta 41,000; Lucca 110,000. The population of Rome fluctuated violently. In 1521 it is supposed to have been about 55,000, but was reduced by the sack to 32,000. After this it rapidly recovered, reaching 45,000 under Paul IV (1558), and 100,000 under Sixtus V (1590). The total population of the States of the Church when the first census was taken in 1656 was 1,880,000.

The final impression one gets after reading the extremely divergent estimates of the population of Spain is that it increased during the first half of the century and decreased during the latter half. The highest figure for the increase of population during the reign of Charles V is the untrustworthy one of Häbler, who believes the number of inhabitants to have doubled. This belief is founded on the conviction that the wealth of the kingdom doubled in that time. But though population tends to increase with wealth, it certainly does not increase in the same proportion as wealth, so that, considering this fact and also that the increase in wealth as shown by the doubling of income from royal domains was in part merely apparent, due to the falling value of money, we may dismiss Häbler's figure as too high. And yet there is good evidence for the belief that there was a considerable increment. The cities especially gained with the new stimulus to commerce and industry. In 1525 Toledo employed 10,000 workers in silk, who had increased fivefold

by 1550. Unfortunately for accuracy these figures are merely contemporary guesses, but they certainly indicate a large growth in the population of Toledo, and similar figures are given for Seville, Burgos and other manufacturing and trading centers. From such estimates, however, combined with the censuses of hearths, peculiarly unsatisfactory in Spain as they excluded the privileged classes and were, as their violent fluctuations show, carelessly made, we may arrive at the conclusion that in 1557 the population of Spain was barely 9,000,000.

More difficult, if possible, is it to measure the amount of the decline in the latter half of the century. It was widely noticed and commented on by contemporaries, who attributed it in part to the increase in sheep-farming (as in England) and in part to emigration to America. There were doubtless other more important and more obscure causes, namely the increasing rivalry in both commerce and industry of the north of Europe and the consequent decay of Spain's means of livelihood. The emigration amounted on the average to perhaps 4000 per annum throughout the century. The total Spanish population of America was reckoned by Velasco in 1574 at 30,500 households, or 152,500 souls. This would, however, imply a much larger emigration, probably double the last number, to account for the many Spaniards lost by the perils of the sea or in the depths of the wilderness. It is known, for example, that whereas the Spanish population of Venezuela was reckoned at 200 households at least 2000 Spaniards had gone to settle there. An emigration of 300,000 before 1574, or say 400,000 for the whole century, would have left a considerable gap at home. Add to this the industrial decline by which Altamira reckons that the cities of the center and north, which suffered most, lost from one-half to one-third of their total population, and it is evident that a very considerable shrinkage took place. The census of 1594 reported a population of 8,200,000.

The same tendency to depopulation was noticed to a much greater degree by contemporary observers of Portugal. Unfortunately, no even approximately accurate figures can be given. Two million is almost certainly too large for 1600.

The following statistical table will enable the reader to form some estimate of the movements of population. Admitting that the margin of error is fairly large in some of the earlier estimates, it is believed that they are sufficiently near the truth to be of real service.

<i>Country</i>	<i>1500</i>	<i>1600</i>
England and Wales	3,000,000	4,100,000
Scotland	500,000	700,000
The Netherlands (Holland and Belgium) (1550)		3,000,000
Germany (including Austria, German Switzerland, Franche Comté and Savoy north of the Alps, but excluding Hungary, the Netherlands, East and West Prussia)	12,000,000	20,000,000
France (1550)		16,000,000
Italy	10,000,000	13,000,000
Spain (1557 and 1594)	9,000,000 <sup>1</sup>	8,200,000
Poland with East and West Prussia		3,000,000
Denmark		600,000
Sweden, Norway and Finland		1,400,000

## § 2. Wealth and Prices

If the number of Europe's inhabitants has increased four-fold since Luther's time, the amount of her wealth has increased in a vastly greater ratio. The difference between the twentieth and the sixteenth centuries is greater than anyone would at first blush believe possible. Moreover it is a difference that is, during times of peace, continually increasing. During the century from the close of the Napoleonic to the opening of the Great War, the wealth of the white races probably doubled every twenty-five years. The new factors that made this possible were the exploited resources of America, and the steam-engine. Prior to 1815 the increase of the world's wealth was much slower, but if it doubled once a century,—as would seem not improbable—we should have to allow that the world of 1914 was one hundred and twenty-eight times as rich as it was in 1514.

Of course such a statement cannot pretend to anything

<sup>1</sup> For a higher estimate—ten to twelve millions in 1500—see note in bibliography.



like exactitude; the mathematical figure is a mere figure of speech; it is intended only to emphasize the fact that one of the most momentous changes during the last four centuries has been that from poverty to affluence. That the statement, surprising as it may seem, is no exaggeration, may be borne out by a few comparisons.

One of the tests of a nation's financial strength is that of war. Francis I in time of war mustered at most an army of 100,000, and he reached this figure, or perhaps slightly exceeded it, only once during his reign, in the years 1536-7. This is only half the number of soldiers, proportionately to the population, that France maintained in time of peace at the opening of the twentieth century. And for more than four years, at a time when war was infinitely more expensive than it was when Pavia was fought, France kept in the field about an even five millions of men, more than an eighth of her population instead of about one one-hundred-and-fiftieth. Similar figures could be given for Germany and England. It is true that the power of modern states is multiplied by their greater facilities for borrowing, but with all allowances the contrast suggests an enormous difference of wealth.

Take, as a standard of comparison, the labor power of the world. In 1918 the United States alone produced 685,000,000 tons of coal. Each ton burned gives almost as much power as is expended by two laborers working for a whole year. Thus the United States from its coal only had command of the equivalent of the labor of 1,370,000,000 men, or more than thrice the adult male labor power of the whole world; more than fifty times the whole labor power of sixteenth-century Europe. This does not take account of the fact that labor is far more productive now than then, even without steam. The comparison is instructive because the population of the United States in 1910 was about equal to that of the whole of Europe in 1600.

The same impression would be given by a comparison of the production of any other standard product. More gold was produced in the year 1915 than the whole stock of gold in the world in 1550, perhaps in 1600. More wheat is pro-

duced annually in Minnesota than the granaries of the cities of the world would hold four centuries ago.

In fact, there was hardly wealth at all in the Middle Ages, only degrees of poverty, and the sixteenth century first began to see the accumulation of fortunes worthy of the name. In 1909 there were 1100 persons in France with an income of more than \$40,000 per annum; among them were 150 with an income of more than \$200,000. In England in 1916 seventy-nine persons paid income taxes on estates of more than \$125,000,000. On the other hand the richest man in France, Jacques Coeur, whose fortune was proverbial like that of Rockefeller today, had in 1503 a capital of only \$5,400,000. The total wealth of the house of Fugger about 1550 has been estimated at \$32,000,000, though the capital of their bank was never anything like that. The contrast was greatest among the very richest class, but it was sufficiently striking in the middle classes. Such a condition as comfort hardly existed.

The same impression will be given to the student of public finance. As more will be said in another paragraph on the revenues of the principal states, only one example need be given here for the sake of contrast. The total revenue of Francis I was \$256,000 per annum, that of Henry II even less, \$228,000. The revenue of France in 1905 was \$750,000,000. Henry VIII often had more difficulty in raising a loan of £50,000 than the English government had recently in borrowing six billions.

It is impossible to say which is the harder task, to compare the total wealth of the world at two given periods, or to compare the value of money at different times. Even the mechanical difficulties in the comparison of prices are enormous. When we read that wheat at Wittenberg sold at one gulden the scheffel, it is necessary to determine in the first place how much a gulden and how much a scheffel represented in terms of dollars and bushels. When we discover that there were half a dozen different guldens, and half a dozen separate measures known as scheffels, varying from province to province and from time to time, and varying



widely, it is evident that great caution is necessary in ascertaining exactly which gulden and exactly which scheffel is meant.

When coin and measure have been reduced to known quantities, there remains the problem of fixing the quality. Cloth is quoted in the sixteenth century as of standard sizes and grades, but neither of these important factors is accurately known to any modern economist. One would think that in quoting prices of animals an invariable standard would be secured. Quite the contrary. So much has the breed of cattle improved that a fat ox now weighs two or three times what a good ox weighed four centuries ago. Horses are larger, stronger and faster; hens lay many more eggs, cows give much more milk now than formerly. Shoes, clothes, lumber, candles, are not of the same quality in different centuries, and of course there is an ever increasing list of new articles in which no comparison can be made.

Nevertheless, some allowance can be made for all factors involved, as far as they are mechanical; some comparisons can be given that bear a sufficiently close relation to exactitude to form the basis from which certain valid deductions can be drawn. Now first as to the intrinsic value, in amounts of gold and silver in the several coins. The vast fluctuation in the value of the English shilling, due to the successive debasements and final restitution of the coinage, is thus expressed:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Troy grains</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Troy grains</i>
1461 .....	133	1551 .....	20
1527 .....	118	1552 .....	88
1543 .....	100	1560 .....	89
1545 .....	60	1601 .....	86
1546 .....	40	1919 .....	87.27

A similar depreciation, more gradual but never rectified, is seen in the value of French money. The standard of reckoning was the livre tournois, which varied intrinsically in value of the silver put into it as follows:

<i>Years</i>	<i>Intrinsic value of silver</i>
1500	93 cents
1512-40	78 cents
1541-60	66 cents
1561-72	62 cents
1573-79	57 cents
1580-1600	51 cents

The standard Spanish gold coin after 1497 was the ducat, which had 3.485 grammes of gold (value in our money \$2.40). This was divided into 375 maravedis, which therefore had a value of about two-thirds of a cent each. A Castilian marc of gold had 230 grammes or a value of about \$16. After 1537 a handsome silver coin, known as the peso fuerte or "piece of eight" because each contained eight reals, was minted in America. Its value was about \$1.06 of our money, it being the predecessor of our dollar.

The great difficulty with the coinage of Germany and Italy is not so much in its fluctuation as in the number of mints. The name gulden was given to almost any coin, originally, as its etymology signifies, a gold piece, but later also to a silver piece. Among gold guildens there was the Rhenish gulden intrinsically worth \$1.34; the Philip's gulden in the Netherlands of 96¢ and the Carolus gulden coined after 1520 and worth \$1.14. But the coin commonly used in reckoning was the silver gulden, worth intrinsically 56¢. This was divided into 20 groschen. Other coins quite ordinarily met with in the literature of the times are pounds (7.5¢), pfennigs (various values), stivers, crowns, nobles, angels (\$2), and Hungarian ducats (\$1.75). Since 1518 the chief silver coin was the thaler, at first considered the equal of a silver gulden. The law of 1559, however, made them two different coins, restoring the thaler to what had probably been its former value of 72¢, and leaving the imperial gulden in law, what it had commonly become in fact, a lesser amount of silver.

The coinage of Italy was dominated by the gold gulden or florin of Florence and the ducat of Venice, each worth not far from \$2.25 of our money. Both these coins, partly

on account of their beauty, partly because of the simple honesty with which they were kept at the nominal standard, attained just fame throughout the Middle Ages and thereafter, and became widely used in other lands.

The standard of value determined, it is now possible to compare the prices of some staple articles. First in importance comes wheat, which fluctuated enormously within short periods at the same place and in terms of the same amounts of silver. From Luther's letters we learn that wheat sold at Wittenberg for one gulden a scheffel in 1539 and for three groschen a scheffel in 1542, the latter price being considered "so cheap as never before," the former reached in a time almost of famine and calling for intervention on the part of the government. However we interpret these figures (and I believe them to mean that wheat sold at from twelve cents to eighty cents a bushel) they certainly indicate a tremendous instability in prices, due to the poor communications and backward methods of agriculture, making years of plenty alternate with years of hunger. In the case of Wittenberg, the lower level was nearer the normal, for in 1527 wheat was there sold at twenty cents a bushel. In other parts of Germany it was dearer; at Strassburg from 1526-50 it averaged 30 cents a bushel; from 1551-75 it went up to an average of 58 cents, and from 1576-1600 the average again rose to 80 cents a bushel.

Prices also rose in England throughout the century even in terms of silver. Of course part of the rise in the middle years was due to the debasement of the coinage. Reduced to bushels and dollars, the following table shows the tendency of prices:

1530	17 cents a bushel
1537	30 cents
1544	45 cents
1546	69 cents
1547	12 cents
1548	24 cents
1549	48 cents
1550	54 cents
1572	66 cents
1595	\$1.14

Wheat in France averaged 23 cents a bushel prior to 1540, after which it rose markedly in price, touching \$1.50 in 1600, under exceptional conditions. In order to compare with prices nowadays we must remember that \$1 a bushel was a remarkably good price before the late war, during which it was fixed at \$2.20 by the American government. Barley in England rose from 6 cents a bushel in 1530 to 10 cents in 1547 and 33 cents in 1549. It was in 1913 70 cents a bushel. Oats rose from 5 cents a bushel in England in 1530 to 18 cents in 1549; in 1913 38 cents.

Animals sold much lower in the sixteenth century than they do now, though it must be remembered that they are worth more after several centuries of careful breeding. Horses then sold at \$2.50 in England and at \$4 to \$11 in France; the average price in 1913 was \$244 for working animals. Cows were worth \$2 in England in 1530; from \$4 to \$6.40 in France; oxen apparently came considerably higher, averaging in England \$10 a head in 1547 and in France from \$9 to \$16 a yoke. At present they are sold by weight, averaging in 1913 9¢ per lb., or \$90 for one weighing a thousand pounds. Beef then cost about  $\frac{2}{3}$  of a cent a pound instead of 40¢ as in 1914. A sheep was sold in 1585 at \$1.60, a large swine at \$5, and pigs at 26¢ apiece. Pork cost 2¢ a pound; hens sold in England at 12¢ a piece and geese and ducks for the same; at Wittenberg geese fetched only 6¢ in 1527. Eggs might have been bought at 2¢ a dozen.

Wholesale prices of groceries, taken mostly from an English table drawn up about 1580, were as follows: Oil was \$140 the ton, or 55 cents a gallon; train-oil was just half that price; Newfoundland fish cost then \$2.50 the quintal dry, as against \$7.81 in 1913. Gascon wines (claret) varied according to quality, from 16 cents to 24 cents a quart. Salt fetched \$7.50 a ton, which is very close to the price that it was in 1913 (\$1.02 per bbl. of 280 lbs.). Soap was \$13 the hundredweight. Pepper and sugar cost nearly the same, about \$70 the hundredweight, or far higher than they were in 1919, when each cost \$11 the hundredweight. Spices also cost more in the sixteenth century than they do

now, and rose throughout the century. By 1580 the whole-sale price per hundredweight was \$224 for cloves, the same for nutmegs, \$150 for cinnamon, \$300 for mace. Ginger was \$90 the hundredweight, and candles 6.6¢ the lb. as against 7.25¢ now.

Drygoods varied immensely in cost. Raw wool sold in England in 1510 for 4 cents per lb., as against 26 cents just four hundred years later. Fine cloth sold at \$65 "the piece," the length and breadth of which it is unfortunately impossible to determine accurately. Different grades came in different sizes, averaging a yard in width, but from 18 yards to 47 yards in length, the finer coming in longer rolls. Sorting cloths were \$45 the piece. Linen cost 20 cents a yard in 1580; Mary, Queen of Scots, five years later paid \$6.50 the yard for purple velvet and 28 cents the yard for buckram to line the same. The coarse clothes of the poor were cheaper, a workman's suit in France costing \$1.80 in 1600, a child's whole wardrobe \$3.40, and a soldier's uniform \$4.20. The prices of the poorest women's dresses ranged from \$3 to \$6 each. In 1520 Albert Dürer paid in the Netherlands 17 cents for one pair of shoes, 33 cents for another and 20 cents for a pair of woman's gloves. A pair of spectacles cost him 22 cents, a pair of gloves for himself 38 cents.

Metals were dearer in the sixteenth century than they are now. Iron cost \$60 a ton in 1580 against \$22 a ton in 1913. Lead fetched \$42 the ton and tin \$15 the cwt. The ratio of gold to silver was about 1 to 11. The only fuel much used was wood, which was fairly cheap but of course not nearly as efficient as our coal.

Interest, as the price of money, varied then as it does now in inverse ratio to the security offered by the debtor, and on the whole within much the same range that it does now. The best security was believed to be that of the German Free Cities, governed as they were by the commercial class that appreciated the virtue of prompt and honest payment. Accordingly, we find that they had no trouble in borrowing at 5 per cent., their bonds taking the form of perpetual annuities, like the English consols. So eagerly were these investments sought that they were apportioned on petition as spe-



cial favors to the creditors. The cities of Paris and London also enjoyed high credit. The national governments had to pay far higher, owing to their poverty and dishonesty. Francis I borrowed at 10 per cent.; Charles V paid higher in the market of Antwerp, the extreme instance being that of 50 per cent. per annum. In 1550 he regularly paid 20 per cent., a ruinous rate that foreshadowed his bankruptcy and was partly caused by its forecast. Until the recent war we were accustomed to think of the great nations borrowing at 2-4 per cent., but during the war the rate immensely rose. Anglo-French bonds, backed by the joint and several credit of the two nations, sold on the New York Stock Exchange in 1918 at a price that would yield the investor more than 12 per cent., and City of Paris bonds at a rate of more than 16 per cent.

Commercial paper, or loans advanced by banks to merchants on good security, of course varied. The lowest was reached at Genoa where from time to time merchants secured accommodation at 3 per cent. The average in Germany was 6 per cent. and this was made the legal rate by Brandenburg in 1565. But usurers, able to take advantage of the necessities of poor debtors, habitually exacted more, as they do now, and loans on small mortgages or on pawned articles often ran at 30 per cent. On the whole, the rate of interest fell slightly during the century.

The price of real estate is more difficult to compare than almost anything, owing to the individual circumstances of each purchase. Land in France sold at rates ranging from \$8 to \$240 the acre. Luther bought a little farm in the country for \$340, and a piece of property in Wittenberg for \$500. After his death, in 1564, the house he lived in, a large and handsome building formerly the Augustinian Cloister, fetched \$2072. The house can be seen today<sup>2</sup> and would certainly, one would think, now bring fifteen times as much.

Books were comparatively cheap. The Greek Testament sold for 48 cents, a Latin Testament for half that amount, a Latin folio Bible published in 1532 for \$4. Luther's first New Testament at 84 cents. One might get a copy of the Pandects

<sup>2</sup> See the photograph in my *Life and Letters of Luther*, p. 364.

for \$1.60, of Vergil for 10 cents, a Greek grammar for 8 cents, Demosthenes and Aeschines in one volume at 20 cents, one of Luther's more important tracts for 30 cents and the condemnation of him by the universities in a small pamphlet at 6 cents. One of the things that has gone down most in price since that day is postage. Dürer while in the Netherlands paid a messenger 17 cents to deliver a letter (or several letters?), presumably sent to his home in Nuremberg.

In accordance with the general rule that wages follow the trend of prices sluggishly, whether upwards or downwards, there is less change to be observed in them throughout the sixteenth century than there is in the prices of commodities. Subject to government regulation, the remuneration of all kinds of labor remained nearly stationary while the cost of living was rising. Startling is the difference in the rewards of the various classes, that of the manual laborers being cruelly low, that of professional men somewhat less in proportion to the cost of living than it is today, and that of government officers being very high. No one except court officials got a salary over \$5000 a year, and some of them got much more. In 1553 a French chamberlain was paid \$51,000 per annum.

A French navy received 8 cents a day in 1550, a carpenter as much as 26 cents. A male domestic was given \$7 to \$12 a year in addition to his keep and a woman \$5 to \$6. As the number of working days in Catholic countries was only about 250 a year, workmen made from \$65 to as low as \$20. If anything, labor was worse paid in Germany than it was in France. Agricultural labor in England was paid in two scales, one for summer and one for winter. It varied from 3 cents to 7 cents a day, the smaller sum being paid only to men who were also boarded. In summer freemasons and master carpenters got from 8 cents to 11 cents for a terribly long day, in winter 6 cents to 9 cents for a shorter day. The following scale was fixed by law in England in 1563: A hired farmer was to have \$10 a year and \$2 for livery; a common farm hand was allowed \$8.25 and \$1.25 extra for livery; a "mean servant" \$6 and \$1.25 respectively, a man child \$4 and \$1; a chief woman cook \$5 and \$1.60, a mean or simple woman \$3 and \$1; a woman child \$2.50 and \$1. All were of course boarded and lodged.



The pay of French soldiers under Francis I was for privates \$28 a year in time of war; this fell to \$14 a year in time of peace; for captains \$33 a month in time of peace and \$66 in time of war. Captains in the English navy received \$36 a month; common seamen \$1.25 a month for wages and the same allowance for food.

The church fared little better than the army. In Scotland, a poor country but one in which the clergy were respected, by the law of 1562, a parson if a single man was given \$26 a year, if a married man a maximum of \$78 a year; probably a parsonage was added. Doubtless many Protestant ministers eked out their subsistence by fees, as the Catholic priests certainly did. Dürer gave 44 cents to a friar who confessed his wife. Every baptism, marriage and burial was taxed a certain amount. In France one could hire a priest to say a mass at from 60 cents to \$7 in 1500, and at from 30 to 40 cents in 1600. At this price it has remained since, a striking instance of religious conservatism working to the detriment of the priest, for the same money represents much less in real wages now than it did then.

Fees for physicians ranged from 33 to 44 cents a visit in Germany about 1520. Treatment and medicine were far higher. At Antwerp Dürer paid \$2.20 for a small quantity of medicine for his wife. Fees were sometimes given for a whole course of attendance. In England we hear of such "cures" paid for at from \$3.30 to \$5. Very little, if any, advice was given free to the poor. The physicians for the French king received a salary of \$200 a year and other favors. William Butts, physician to Henry VIII, had \$500 per annum, in addition to a knighthood; and his salary was increased to over \$600 for attending the Duke of Richmond.

Teachers in the lower schools were regarded as lackeys and paid accordingly. Nicholas Udal, head master of Eton, received \$50 per annum and various small allowances. University professors were treated more liberally. Luther and Melanchthon at Wittenberg got a maximum of \$224 per annum, which was about the same as the stipend of leading professors in other German universities and at Oxford and Cambridge. The teacher also got a small honorarium from each student. When Paul III restored the Sapienza at Rome

he paid a minimum of \$17 per annum to some friars who taught theology and who were cared for by their order, but he gave high salaries to the professors of rhetoric and medicine. Ordinarily these received \$476 a year, but one professor of the classics reached the highwatermark with nearly \$800.

The rewards of literary men were more consistently small in the sixteenth century than they are now, owing to the absence of effective copyright. An author usually received a small sum from the printer to whom he first offered his manuscript, but his subsequent royalties, if any, depended solely on the goodwill of the publisher. A Wittenberg printer offered Luther \$224 per annum for his manuscripts, but the Reformer declined it, wishing to make his books as cheap as possible. In 1512 Erasmus got \$8.40 from Badius the Parisian printer for a new edition of his *Adages*. In fact, the rewards of letters, such as they were, were indirect, in the form of pensions, gifts and benefices from the great. Erasmus got so many of these favors that he lived more than comfortably. Luther died almost a rich man, so many *honoraria* did he collect from noble admirers. Rabelais was given a benefice, though he only lived two years afterwards to enjoy its fruits. Henry VIII gave \$500 to Thomas Murner for writing against Luther. But the lot of the average writer was hard. Fulsome flattery was the most lucrative production of the muse.

Artists fared better. Dürer sold one picture for \$375 and another for \$200, not counting the "tip" which his wife asked and received on each occasion from the patron. Probably his woodcuts brought him more from the printers than any single painting, and when he died he left the then respectable sum of \$32,000. He had been offered a pension of \$300 per annum and a house at Antwerp by that city if he would settle there, but he preferred to return to Nuremberg, where he was pensioned \$600 a year by the emperor. Leonardo da Vinci and Michelangelo both received \$129 a month for work done for a prince, and the latter was given a pension of \$5200 a year by Paul III. Raphael in 1520 left an estate of \$140,000.

If a comparison of the value of money is made, the final impression that one gets is that an ounce of gold was in 1563, let us say, expected to do about ten times as much work as the same weight of precious metal performed in 1913.<sup>3</sup> If a few articles were then actually dearer, they were comparatively unimportant and were balanced by other articles even more than ten times as cheap. But a dollar will buy so many articles now which did not exist in former ages that a plausible case can be made out for the paradox that money is now worth more than it ever was before. If an ounce of gold would in Luther's time exchange for a much larger quantity of simple necessities than it will purchase now, on the other hand a man with an income of \$5000 a year is far better off than a man with the same income, or indeed with any income, was then.

Notwithstanding the great difficulties of making out any fair index number representing the cost of living and applicable to long periods, owing to the fact that articles vary from time to time, as when candles are replaced by gas and gas by electricity, yet the general trend of prices can be pretty plainly ascertained. Generally speaking, prices—measured in weight of gold and not in coin—sank slowly from 1390 till 1520 under the influence of better technical methods of production and possibly of the draining of gold and silver to the Orient. From 1520 till 1560 prices rose quite slowly on account of the increased production of gold and silver and its more rapid circulation by means of better banking. From 1560 to 1600 prices rose with enormous rapidity, partly because of the destruction of wealth and increase in the cost of production following in the wake of the French and Dutch wars of religion, and still more, perhaps, on account of the torrent of American silver suddenly poured into the lap of Europe. Taking the century as a whole, we find that wheat rose the most, as much as 150 per cent. in England, 200 per cent. in France and 300 per cent. in Germany. Other articles rose less, and in some cases remained stationary, or

<sup>3</sup> No valid comparison can be made for the years after 1913, for in most nations paper currencies have ousted gold.

sank in price. Money wages rose slowly, far less than the cost of living.

Apart from special circumstances affecting the production of particular classes of goods, the main cause of the general trend of prices upwards was probably the increase in the volume of the precious metals. Just how great this was, it is impossible to determine, and yet a calculation can be made, yielding figures near enough the actual to be of service. From the middle of the fifteenth century there had been a considerable increase in the production of silver from German, Bohemian and Hungarian mines. Although this increase was much more than is usually allowed for—equalling, in the opinion of one scholar, the produce of American mines until nearly the middle of the sixteenth century—it was only enough to meet the expanding demands of commerce. Before America entered the market, there was also a considerable import of gold from Asia and Africa. The tide of Mexican treasure began to flood Spain about 1520, but did not reach the other countries in large quantities until about 1560. When we consider the general impression concerning the increase of the currency immediately following the pillage of the Aztecs and Incas, the following statistics of the English mint are instructive, if they are not enigmatical. During the first fourteen years of Henry VIII (1509-23) the average amount of gold minted in England was 24,666 troy pounds per annum, and of silver 31,225 troy pounds. But in the years 1537-40, before the great debasement of the currency had taken place, the amount of gold coined fell to 3,297 troy pounds per annum, and that of silver rose only to 52,974 troy pounds. As each pound of gold was at that time worth as much as eleven pounds of silver, this means that the actual amount of new money put into circulation each year in the latter period was less than a third of that minted in the earlier years. The figures also indicate the growing cheapness of silver, stimulating its import, while the import of gold was greatly restricted, according to Gresham's law that cheap money drives out dear.

The spoil of Mexico and Peru has frequently been overestimated, by none more extravagantly than by the Con-

quistadores and their contemporaries. But the estimates of modern scholars vary enormously. Lexis believes that the total amount of gold produced by Europe and America from 1501 to 1550 (the greater part, of course, by America) amounted to \$134,000,000. F. de Laiglesio, on the other hand, thinks that not more than \$4,320,000 was mined in America before 1555. The most careful estimate, that made by Professor Haring, arrives at the following results, the amounts being given in pesos each worth very nearly the same as our dollar. Mexican production:

	1521-44	1545-60
Gold	5,348,900	343,670
Silver	4,130,170	22,467,111

For Peru the proportions of gold and silver cannot be separated, but the totals taken together from 1531-1560 amounted to probably 84,350,000 pesos. Other small sums came from other parts of the New World, and the final total for production of gold *and* silver in America until 1560 is given at 139,720,000 pesos. This is a reduction to 70 per cent. of the estimate of Lexis. Assuming that the same correction must be made on all of the estimates given by Lexis we have the following figures for the world's production of precious metals in kilogrammes and in dollars:<sup>4</sup>

	Gold		Silver	
	Average per annum		Average per annum in pesos or dollars of 25	
	in kilos	in dollars	kilos	grammes
1493-1520	4270	3,269,000	31,570	1,262,800
1521-44	4893	3,425,000	52,010	2,080,400
1545-60	4718	3,302,600	184,730	7,389,200
1561-80	4718	3,302,600	185,430	7,417,200
1581-1600	4641	3,268,700	230,480	9,219,200

<sup>4</sup> These figures are based on those of Sommerlad in the *Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, s.v. "Preis." taken from Wiebe, who based on Lexis. Figures quite similar to those of Sommerlad are given by C. F. Bastable in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, s.v. "Money." I have incorporated Haring's corrections.



Combining these figures we see that the production of gold was pretty steady throughout the century, making a total output of about \$330,000,000. The production of silver, however, greatly increased after 1544. From the beginning of the century to that year it amounted to \$75,285,600; from 1545 to 1600 inclusive it increased to \$450,955,200, making a total output for the century of \$526,240,800. Of course these figures only roughly approximate the truth; nevertheless they give a correct idea of the general processes at work. Even for the first half of the century the production of the precious metals was far in excess of anything that had preceded, and this output, large as it was, was nearly tripled in the last half of the century. These figures, however, are extremely modest compared with those of recent times, when more gold is mined in a year than was then mined in a century. The total amount mined in 1915 was \$470,000,000; in 1917 \$428,000,000; for the period 1850 to 1916 inclusive the total amount mined was \$13,678,000,000.

### § 3. Institutions

For a variety of reasons the sixteenth century was as monarchical in mind as the twentieth century is democratic. Immemorial prescription then had a vigor since lost, and monarchy descended from classical and biblical antiquity when kings were hedged with a genuine divinity. The study of Roman law, with its absolutist maxims, aided in the formation of royalist sentiment. The court as the center of fashion attracted a brilliant society, while the small man satisfied his cravings for gentility by devouring the court gossip that even then clogged the presses. It is probable that one reason why the throne became so popular was that it was, next to the church, the best advertised article in the world. But underlying these sentimental reasons for loyalty there was a basis of solid utility, predisposing men to support the scepter as the one power strong enough to overawe the nobles. One tyrant was better than many; one lion could do less harm than a pack of wolves and hyaenas. In the greater states men felt perfectly helpless without a king to rule the anarchical chaos into which society would have dissolved

without him. When the Spanish Communes rebelled against Charles V they triumphed in the field, but their attempt simply collapsed in face of their utter inability to solve the problem of government without a royal governor. They were as helpless as bees without a queen. Indeed, so strong was their instinct to get a royal head that they tried to preserve themselves by kidnapping Charles's mother, poor, mad Joanna, to fill the political vacuum that they had made. So in the civil wars in France; notwithstanding the more promising materials for the formation of a republic in that country, all parties were, in fact, headed by claimants to the throne.

Next to the king came the Council of State, composed of princes of the blood, cardinals, nobles and some officers and secretaries of state, not always of noble blood but frequently, especially in the cases of the most powerful of them, scions of the middle class. What proportion of the executive power was wielded by the Council depended on the personal character of the monarch. Henry VIII was always master; Elizabeth was more guided than guiding; the Councils of the Valois and Hapsburgs profited by the pre-occupation or the stupidity of their masters to usurp the royal power for themselves. In public opinion the Council occupied a great place, similar to that of an English Cabinet today. The first Anglican prayerbook contains petitions for the Council, though it did not occur to the people to pray for Parliament until the next century.

The countries were governed no longer by the nobles as such but by officials appointed by the crown. It is an indication of the growing nationalization of policy that the sixteenth century saw the first establishment of permanent diplomatic agents. The first ambassadors, selected largely from a panel of bishops, magistrates, judges and scholars, were expected to function not only as envoys but also as spies. Under them was a host of secret agents expected to do underhand work and to take the responsibility for it themselves so that, if found out, they could be repudiated.

Very powerful was the national popular assembly: the Parliament, the Diet, the States General, or the Cortes. Its



functions, prescriptive and undefined, were commonly understood to include the granting of taxes. The assent of the body was also required, to a varying degree, for the sanction of other laws. But the real power of the people's representatives lay in the fact that they were the chief organ for the expression of that public opinion which in all countries and at all times it is unsafe for governments to disregard. Sitting in two or more chambers to represent the several estates or sometimes—as in the German Diet—subdivisions of these estates, the representatives were composed of members of the privileged orders, the clergy and nobility, and of the elected representatives of the city aristocracies. The majority of the population, the poor, were unrepresented. That this class had as great a stake in the commonwealth as any other, and that they had a class consciousness capable of demanding reforms and of taking energetic measures to secure them, is shown by a number of rebellions of the proletariat, and yet it is not unfair to them, or disdainful, to say that on most matters they were too uninstructed, too powerless and too mute to contribute much to that body of sentiment called public opinion, one condition of which seems to be that to exist it must find expression.

The Estates General, by whatever name they were called, supplemented in France by provincial bodies called Parlements partaking of the nature of high courts of justice, and in Germany by the local Diets (Landtag) of the larger states, exercised a very real and in some cases a decisive influence on public policy. The monarch of half the world dared not openly defy the Cortes of Aragon or of Castile; the imperious Tudors diligently labored to get parliamentary sanction for their tyrannical acts, and, on the few occasions when they could not do so, hastened to abandon as gracefully as possible their previous intentions. In Germany the power of the Diet was not limited by the emperor, but by the local governments, though even so it was considerable. When a Diet, under skilful manipulation or by unscrupulous trickery, was induced by the executive to pass an unpopular measure, like the Edict of Worms, the law became a dead letter. In some other instances, notably in its long campaign against

monopolies, even when it expressed the popular voice the Diet failed because the emperor was supported by the wealthy capitalists. Only recently it has been revealed how the Fuggers of Augsburg and their allies endeavored to manipulate or to frustrate its work in the matter of government regulation of industry and commerce.

The finances of most countries were managed corruptly and unwisely. The taxes were numerous and complicated and bore most heavily on the poor. From ordinary taxes in most countries the privileged orders were exempt, though they were forced to contribute special sums levied by themselves. The general property tax (*taille*) in France yielded 2,400,000 livres tournois in 1517 and 4,600,000 in 1543. The taxes were farmed; that is, the right of collecting them was sold at auction, with the natural result that they were put into the hands of extortioners who made vast fortunes by oppressing the people. Revenues of the royal domain, excises on salt and other articles, import and export duties, and the sale of offices and monopolies, supplemented the direct taxes. The system of taxation varied in each country. Thus in Spain the 10 per cent. tax on the price of an article every time it was sold and the royalty on precious metals—20 per cent. after 1504—proved important sources of revenue. Rome drove a lucrative trade in spiritual wares. Everywhere, fines for transgressions of the law figured more largely as a source of revenue than they do nowadays.

Expenditures were both more wasteful and more niggardly than they are today. Though the service of the public debt was trifling compared with modern standards, and though the administration of justice was not expensive because of the fee system, the army and navy cost a good deal, partly because they were composed largely of well paid mercenaries. The personal extravagances of the court were among the heaviest burdens borne by the people. The kings built palaces; they wallowed in cloth of gold; they collected objects of art; they squandered fortunes on mistresses and minions; they made constant progresses with a retinue of thousands of servants and horses. The two greatest states, France and Spain, both went into bankruptcy in 1557.

The great task of government, that of keeping public order, protecting life and property and punishing the criminal, was approached by our forbears with more gusto than success. The laws were terrible, but they were unequally executed. In England among capital crimes were the following: murder, arson, escape from prison, hunting by night with painted faces or visors, embezzling property worth more than 40 shillings, carrying horses or mares into Scotland, conjuring, practising witchcraft, removing landmarks, desertion from the army, counterfeiting or mutilating coins, cattle-lifting, house-breaking, picking of pockets. All these were punished by hanging, but crimes of special heinousness, such as poisoning, were visited with burning or boiling to death. The numerous laws against treason and heresy have already been described. Lesser punishments included flogging, pillory, branding, the stocks, clipping ears, piercing tongues, and imprisonment in dungeons made purposely as horrible as possible, dark, noisome dens without furniture or conveniences, often too small for a man to stand upright or to lie at full length.

With such laws it is not surprising that 72,000 men were hanged under Henry VIII, an average of nearly 2,000 a year. The number at present, when the population of England and Wales has swollen to tenfold of what it was then, is negligible. Only nine men were hanged in the United Kingdom in the years 1901-3; about 5,000 are now on the average annually convicted of felony. If anything, the punishments were harsher on the Continent than in Britain. The only refuge of the criminal was the greed of his judges. At Rome it was easy and regular to pay a price for every crime, and at other places bribery was more or less prevalent.

The methods of trying criminals were as cruel as their punishments. On the Continent the presumption was held to be against the accused, and the rack and its ghastly retinue of instruments of pain were freely used to procure confession. Calvin's hard saying that when men felt the pain they spoke the truth merely expressed the current delusion, for legislators and judges, their hearts hardened in part by the example of the church, concurred in his opinion. The exceptional

protest of Montaigne deserves to be quoted for its humanity: "All that exceeds simple death is absolute cruelty, nor can our laws expect that he whom the fear of decapitation or hanging will not restrain should be awed by imagining the horrors of a slow fire, burning pincers or breaking on the wheel."

The spirit of the English law was against the use of torture, which, however, made progress, especially in state trials, under the Tudors. A man who refused to plead in an English court was subjected to the *peine forte et dure*, which consisted in piling weights on his chest until he either spoke or was crushed to death. To enforce the laws there was a constabulary in the country, supplemented by the regular army, and a police force in the cities. That of Paris consisted of 240 archers, among them twenty-four mounted men. The inefficiency of some of the English officers is amusingly caricatured in the persons of Dogberry and Verges who, when they saw a thief, concluded that he was no honest man and the less they had to meddle or make with him the more for their honesty.

If, in all that has just been said, it is evident that the legislation of that period and of our own had the same conception of the function of government and only differed in method and efficiency, there was one very large class of laws spread upon the statute-books of medieval Europe that has almost vanished now. A paternal statesmanship sought to regulate the private lives of a citizen in every respect: the fashion of his clothes, the number of courses at his meals, how many guests he might have at wedding, dinner or dance, how long he should be permitted to haunt the tavern, and how much he should drink, how he should spend Sunday, how he should become engaged, how dance, how part his hair and with how thick a stick he should be indulged in the luxury of beating his wife.

The "blue laws," as such regulations on their moral side came to be called, were no Protestant innovation. The Lutherans hardly made any change whatever in this respect, but Calvin did give a new and biting intensity to the medieval spirit. His followers, the Puritans, in the next century, almost

succeeded in reducing the staple of a Christian man's legitimate recreation to "seasonable meditation and prayer." But the idea originated long before the evolution of "the non-conformist conscience."

The fundamental cause of all this legislation was sheer conservatism. Primitive men and savages have so strong a feeling of the sanction of custom that they have, as Bagehot expresses it, fairly screwed themselves down by their unreasoning demands for conformity. A good deal of this spirit has survived throughout history and far more of it, naturally, was found four centuries ago than at present, when reason has proved a solvent for so many social institutions. There are a good many laws of the period under survey—such as that of Nuremberg against citizens parting their hair—for which no discoverable basis can be found save the idea that new-fangled fashions should not be allowed.

Economic reasons also played their part in the regulation of the habits of the people. Thus a law of Edward VI, after a preamble setting forth that divers kinds of food are indifferent before God, nevertheless commands all men to eat fish as heretofore on fast days, not as a religious duty but to encourage fishermen, give them a livelihood and thus train men for the navy.

A third very strong motive in the mind of the sixteenth-century statesmen, was that of differentiating the classes of citizens. The blue laws, if they may be so called in this case, were secretions of the blue blood. To make the vulgar know their places it was essential to make them dress according to their rank. The intention of An Act for the Reformation of excess in Apparel, passed by the English Parliament in 1532, was stated to be,

the necessary repressing and avoiding and expelling of the excess daily more used in the sumptuous and costly apparel and array accustomedly worn in this Realm, whereof hath ensued and daily do chance such sundry high and notorious detriments of the common weal, the subversion of good and politic order in knowledge and distinction of people according to their estates, preemi-



nences, dignities and degrees to the utter impoverishment and undoing of many inexperienced and light persons inclined to pride, mother of all vices.

The tenor of the act prescribes the garb appropriate to the royal family, to nobles of different degree, to citizens according to their income, to servants and husbandmen, to the clergy, doctors of divinity, soldiers, lawyers and players. Such laws were common in all countries. A Scotch act provides "that it be lauchful to na women to weir [clothes] abone [above] their estait except howries." This law was not only "appreivit" by King James VI, but endorsed with his own royal hand, "This acte is verray gude."

Excessive fare at feasts was provided against for similar reasons and with almost equal frequency. By an English proclamation the number of dishes served was to be regulated according to the rank of the highest person present. Thus, if a cardinal was guest or host, there might be nine courses, if a lord of Parliament six, for a citizen with an income of five hundred pounds a year, three. Elsewhere the number of guests at all ordinary functions as well as the number and price of gifts at weddings, christenings and like occasions, was prescribed.

Games of chance were frequently forbidden. Francis I ordered a lieutenant with twenty archers to visit taverns and gaming houses and arrest all players of cards, dice and other unlawful games. This did not prevent the establishment of a public lottery, a practice justified by alleging the examples of Italian cities in raising revenue by this means. Henry III forbade all games of chance "to minors and other debauched persons," and this was followed six years later by a crushing impost on cards and dice, interesting as one of the first attempts to suppress the instruments of vice through the taxing power. Merry England also had many laws forbidding "tennis, bowles, dicing and cards," the object being to encourage the practice of archery.

Tippling was the subject of occasional animadversion by the various governments, though there seemed to be little sentiment against it until the opening of the following cen-



ture. The regulation of the number of taverns and of the amount of wine that might be kept in a gentleman's cellar, as prescribed in an English law, mentions not the moral but the economic aspect of drinking. The purchase of French wines was said to drain England of money.

Though the theater also did not suffer much until the time of Cromwell, plays were forbidden in the precincts of the city of London. The Book of Discipline in Scotland forbade attendance at theaters. Calvin thoroughly disapproved of them, and even Luther considered them "fools' work" and at times dangerous.

Commendable efforts to suppress the practice of duelling were led by the Catholic church. Clement VII forbade it in a bull, confirmed by a decree of the Council of Trent. An extraordinarily worded French proclamation of 1566 forbade "all gentlemen and others to give each other the lie and, if they do give each other the lie, to fight a duel about it." Other governments took the matter up very sluggishly. Scotland forbade "the great liberty that sundry persons take in provoking each other to singular combats upon sudden and frivol occasions," without license from his majesty.

Two matters on which the Puritans felt very keenly, blasphemy and Sabbath-breaking, were but scantily looked after in the century of the Reformation. Scotland forbade "grievous and abominable oaths, swearing, execrations and blasphemation," and somewhat similar laws can be found in other countries. Scotland was also a pioneer in forbidding on the Sabbath all work, "gaming, playing, passing to taverns and alehouses and wilful remaining away from the parish kirk in time of sermon."

Government has other functions than the enforcement of the civil and criminal law. Almost contemporary with the opening of the century was the establishment of post offices for the forwarding of letters. After Maximilian had made a start in the Netherlands other countries were not slow to follow his example. Though under special government supervision at first these letter-carriers were private men.

In the Middle Ages there had been efforts to safeguard public sanitation. The sixteenth century did not greatly im-

prove on them. Thus, Geneva passed a law that garbage and other refuse should not be allowed to lie in the streets for more than three days in summer or eight days in winter. In extreme cases quarantine was adopted as a precaution against epidemics.

It is the most heart-breaking or the most absurd fact in human history, according as the elements involved are focused in a humane or in a cynical light, that the chief energies of government as well as the most zealous forces of peoples, have been dedicated since civilization began to the practice of wholesale homicide. As we look back from the experience of the Great War to the conflicts of other times, they seem to our jaded imaginations almost as childish as they were vicious. In the sixteenth century, far more than in the nineteenth, the nations boiled and bubbled with spleen and jealousy, hurled Thrasonical threats and hyperbolic boasts in each other's teeth, breathing out mutual extermination with no compunctious visitings of nature to stay their hungry swords—but when they came to blows they had not the power of boys. The great nations were always fighting but never fought to a finish. In the whole century no national capital west of Hungary, save Rome and Edinburgh, was captured by an enemy. The real harm was not done on the battlefield, where the carnage was incredibly small, but in the raids and looting of town and country by the professional assassins who filled the ranks of the hireling troops. Then, indeed, cities were burned, wealth was plundered and destroyed, men were subjected to nameless tortures and women to indescribable outrages, and children were tossed on pikes. Nor did war seem then to shock the public conscience, as it has at last succeeded in doing. The people saw nothing but dazzling glory in the slaughter of foemen on the stricken field, in the fanfare of the trumpets and the thunder of the captains and the shouting. Soldiers, said Luther, founding his opinion on the canon law, might be in a state of grace, for war was as necessary as eating, drinking or any other business. Statesmen like Machiavelli and Bacon were keen for the largest armies possible, as the mainstay of a nation's power. Only Erasmus was a clear-sighted pacifist, always

declaiming against war and once asserting that he agreed with Cicero in thinking the most unjust peace preferable to the justest war. Elsewhere he admitted that wars of self-defence were necessary.

Fire-arms had not fully established their ascendancy in the period of Frundsberg, or even of Alva. As late as 1596 an English soldier lamented that his countrymen neglected the bow for the gun. Halberdiers with pikes were the core of the army. Artillery sometimes inflicted very little damage, as at Flodden, sometimes considerable, as at Marignano, where, with the French cavalry, it struck down the till then almost invincible Swiss infantry. In battle arquebusiers and musketeers were interspersed with cross-bowmen. Cannon of a large type gave way to smaller field-guns; even the idea of the machine-gun emerged in the fifteenth century. The name of them, "organs," was taken from their appearance with numerous barrels from which as many as fifty bullets could be discharged at a time. Cannon were transported to the field on carts. Rifles were invented by a German in 1520, but not much used. Pistols were first manufactured at Pistoia—whence the name—about 1540. Bombs were first used in 1588.

The arts of fortification and of siege were improved together, many ingenious devices being called into being by the technically difficult war of the Spaniards against the Dutch. Tactics were not so perfect as they afterwards became and of strategy there was no consistent theory. Machiavelli, who wrote on the subject, based his ideas on the practice of Rome and therefore despised fire-arms and preferred infantry to cavalry. Discipline was severe, and needed to be, notwithstanding which there were sporadic and often very annoying mutinies. Punishments were terrible, as in civil life. Blasphemy, cards, dicing, duelling and women were forbidden in most regular armies, but in time of war the soldiers were allowed an incredible license in pillaging and in foraging. Rings and other decorations were given as rewards of valor. Uniforms began first to be introduced in England by Henry VIII.

The personnel of the armies was extremely bad. Not counting the small number of criminals who were allowed to expiate their misdeeds by military service, the rank and file consisted of mercenaries who only too rapidly became criminals under the tutelage of Mars. There were a few conscripts, but no universal training such as Machiavelli recommended. The officers were nobles or gentlemen who served for the prestige and glory of the profession of arms, as well as for the good pay.

But the most striking difference between armies then and now is not in their armament nor in their quality but in the size. Great battles were fought and whole campaigns decided with twenty or thirty thousand troops. The French standing army was fixed by the ordinance of 1534 at seven legions of six thousand men each, besides which were the mercenaries, the whole amounting to a maximum, under Francis I, of about 100,000 men. The English official figures about 1588 gave the army 90,000 foot soldiers and 9000 horse, but these figures were grossly exaggerated. In fact only 22,000 men were serviceable at the crisis of England's war with Spain. Other armies were proportionately small. The janizaries, whose intervention often decided battles, numbered in 1520 only 12,000. They were perhaps the best troops in Europe, as the Turkish artillery was the most powerful known. What all these figures show, in short, is that the phenomenon of nations with every man physically fit in the army, engaging in a death grapple until one goes down in complete exhaustion, is a modern development.

The influence of sea power upon history has become proverbial, if, indeed, it has not been overestimated since Admiral Mahan first wrote. It may be pointed out that this influence is far from a constant factor. Sea power had a considerable importance in the wars of Greece and of Rome, but in the Middle Ages it became negligible. Only with the opening of the seven seas to navigation was the command of the waves found to secure the avenues to wealth and colonial expansion. In Portugal, Spain, and England, "the blue water school" of mariners speedily created navies whose strife was

apparently more decisive for the future of history than were the battles of armies on land.

When the trade routes of the Atlantic superseded those of the Mediterranean in importance, naturally methods of navigation changed, and this involved a revolution in naval warfare greater than that caused by steam or by the submarine. From the time that Helen's beauty launched a thousand ships until the battle of Lepanto, the oar had been the chief instrument of locomotion, though supplemented, even from Homeric times, by the sail. Naval battles were like those on land; the enemy keels approached and the soldiers on each strove to board and master the other's crew. The only distinctly naval tactic was that of "ramming," as it was called in a once vivid metaphor.

But the wild winds and boisterous waves of the Atlantic broke the oar in the galley-slave's hand and the muscles in his back. Once again man harnessed the hostile forces of nature; the free breezes were broken to the yoke and new types of sailing ships were driven at racing speed across the broad back of the sea. Swift, yare vessels were built, at first smaller than the old galleons but infinitely more manageable. And the new boats, armed with thunder as they were clad with wings, no longer sought to sink or capture enemies at close quarters, but hurled destruction from afar. Heavy guns took the place of small weapons and of armed prow.

It was England's genius for the sea that enabled her to master the new conditions first and most completely and that placed the trident in her hands so firmly that no enemy has ever been able to wrest it from her. Henry VIII paid great attention to the navy. He had fifty-three vessels with an aggregate of 11,268 tons, an average of 200 tons each, carrying 1750 soldiers, 1250 sailors and 2085 guns. Under Elizabeth the number of vessels had sunk to 42, but the tonnage had risen to 17,055, and the crews numbered 5534 seamen, 804 gunners and 2008 soldiers. The largest ships of the Tudor navy were of 1000 tons; the flagship of the Spanish Armada was 1150 tons, carrying 46 guns and 422 men. How tiny are these figures! A single cruiser of today has a larger tonnage



than the whole of Elizabeth's fleet; a large submarine is greater than the monsters of Philip.

#### § 4. Private Life and Manners

Of all the forces making for equality among men probably the education of the masses by means of cheap books and papers has been the strongest. But this force has been slow to ripen; at the close of the Middle Ages the common man was still helpless. The old privileged orders were indeed weakened and despoiled of part of their prerogatives, but it was chiefly by the rise of a new aristocracy, that of wealth.

The decay of feudalism and of ecclesiastical privilege took the form of a changed and not of an abolished position for peer and priest. They were not cashiered, but they were retained on cheaper terms. The feudal baron had been a petty king; his descendant had the option of becoming either a highwayman or a courtier. As the former alternative became less and less rewarding, the greater part of the old nobles abandoned their pretensions to independence and found a congenial sphere as satellites of a monarch, "le roi soleil," as a typical king was aptly called, whose beams they reflected and around whom they circled.

As titles of nobility began now to be quite commonly given to men of wealth and also to politicians, the old blood was renewed at the expense of the ancient pride. Not, indeed, that the latter showed any signs of diminishing. The arrogance of the noble was past all toleration. Men of rank treated the common citizens like dirt beneath their feet, and even regarded artists and other geniuses as menials. Alphonso, duke of Ferrara, wrote to Raphael in terms that no king would now use to a photographer, calling him a liar and chiding him for disrespect to his superior. The same duke required Ariosto to prostitute his genius by writing an apology for a fratricide committed by his grace. The duke of Mayenne poniarded one of his most devoted followers for having aspired to the hand of the duke's widowed daughter-in-law. So difficult was it to conceive of a "gentleman" without gentle blood that Castiglione, the arbiter of manners, lays



down as the first prerequisite to a perfect courtier that he shall be of high birth. And of course those who had not this advantage pretended to it. An Italian in London noticed in 1557 that all gentlemen without other title insisted on being called "mister."

One sign of the break-up of the old medieval castes was the new classification of men by calling, or profession. It is true that two of the professions, the higher offices in army and church, became apanages of the nobility, and the other liberal vocations were almost as completely monopolized by the children of the moneyed middle class; nevertheless it is significant that there were new roads by which men might rise. No class has profited more by the evolution of ideas than has the intelligentsia. From a subordinate, semimenial position, lawyers, physicians, educators and journalists, not to mention artists and writers, have become the leading, almost the ruling, body of our western democracies.

Half way between a medieval estate and a modern calling stood the clergy. In Catholic countries they remained very numerous; there were 136 episcopal or archiepiscopal sees in France; there were 40,000 parish priests, with an equal number of secular clergy in subordinate positions, 24,000 canons, 34,000 friars, 2500 Jesuits (in 1600), 12,000 monks and 80,000 nuns. Though there were doubtless many worthy men among them, it cannot honestly be said that the average were fitted either morally or intellectually for their positions. Grossly ignorant of the meaning of the Latin in which they recited their masses and of the main articles of their faith, many priests made up for these defects by proficiency in a variety of superstitious charms. The public was accustomed to see nuns dancing at bridals and priests haunting taverns and worse resorts. Some attempts, serious and partially successful, at reform, have been already described. Profane and amatory plays were forbidden in nunneries, bull-fights were banished from the Vatican and the dangers of the confessional were diminished by the invention of the closed box in which the priest should sit and hear his penitent through a small aperture instead of having her kneeling at

his knees. So depraved was public opinion on the subject of the confession that a prolonged controversy took place in Spain as to whether minor acts of impurity perpetrated by the priest while confessing women were permissible or not.

Neither was the average Protestant clergyman a shining and a burning light. So little was the calling regarded that it was hard to fill it. At one time a third of the parishes of England were said to lack incumbents. The stipends were wretched; the social position obscure. The wives of the new clergy had an especially hard lot, being regarded by the people as little better than concubines, and by Parliament called "necessary evils." The English government had to issue injunctions in 1559 stating that because of the offence that has come from the type of women commonly selected as helpmates by parsons, no manner of priest or deacon should presume to marry without consent of the bishop, of the girl's parents, "or of her master or mistress where she serveth." Many clergymen, nevertheless, afterwards married domestics.

Very little was done to secure a properly trained ministry. Less than half of the 2000 clergymen ordained at Wittenberg from 1537-60 were university men; the majority were drapers, tailors and cobblers, "common idiots and laymen" as they were called—though the word "idiot" did not have quite the same disparaging sense that it has now. Nor were the reverend gentlemen of unusually high character. As nothing was demanded of them but purity of doctrine, purity of life sank into the background. It is really amazing to see how an acquaintance of Luther's succeeded in getting one church after he had been dismissed from another on well-founded charges of seduction, and how he was thereafter convicted of rape. This was perhaps an extreme case, but that the majority of clergymen were morally unworthy is the melancholy conviction borne in by contemporary records.

Sermons were long, doctrinal and political. Cranmer advised Latimer not to preach more than an hour and a half lest the king grow weary. How the popular preacher—in this case a Catholic—appealed to his audience, is worth quoting from a sermon delivered at Landau in 1550.

The Lutherans [began the reverend gentleman] are opposed to the worship of Mary and the saints. Now, my friends, be good enough to listen to me. The soul of a man who had died got to the door of heaven and Peter shut it in his face. Luckily, the Mother of God was taking a stroll outside with her sweet Son. The deceased addresses her and reminds her of the Paters and Aves he has recited in her glory and the candles he has burnt before her images. Thereupon Mary says to Jesus: "It's the honest truth, my Son." The Lord, however, objected and addressed the suppliant: "Hast thou never heard that I am the way and the door to life everlasting?" he asks. "If thou art the door, I am the window," retorted Mary, taking the "soul" by the hair and flinging it through the open casement. And now I ask you whether it is not the same whether you enter Paradise by the door or by the window?

There was a naïve familiarity with sacred things in our ancestors that cannot be imitated. Who would now name a ship "Jesus," as Hawkins's buccaneering slaver was named? What serious clergyman would now compare three of his friends to the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, as did Luther? The Reformer also wrote a satire on the calling of a council, in the form of a letter from the Holy Ghost signed by Gabriel as notary and witnessed by Michael the Provost of Paradise and Raphael, God's Court Physician. At another time he made a lampoon on the collection of relics made by his enemy the Archbishop of Mayence, stating that they contained such things as "a fair piece of Moses' left horn, a whole pound of the wind that blew for Elijah in the cave on Mount Horeb and two feathers and an egg of the Holy Ghost" as a dove. All this, of course, not in ribald profanity, but in works intended for edification. . . .

Though beautiful, the city of our ancestors was far from admirable in other ways. Filth was hidden under its comely garments, so that it resembled a Cossack prince—all ermine and vermin. Its narrow streets, huddled between strong walls, were over-run with pigs and chickens and filled with refuse.

They were often ill-paved, flooded with mud and slush in winter. Moreover they were dark and dangerous at night, infested with princes and young nobles on a spree and with other criminals.

Like the exterior, the interior of the house of a substantial citizen was more pretty than clean or sweet smelling. The high wainscoting and the furniture, in various styles, but frequently resembling what is now known as "mission," was lovely, as were the ornaments—tapestries, clocks, pictures and flowers. But the place of carpets were supplied by rushes renewed from time to time without disturbing the underlying mass of rubbish beneath. Windows were fewer than they are now, and fires still fewer. Sometimes there was an open hearth, sometimes a huge tile stove. Most houses had only one or two rooms heated, sometimes, as in the case of the Augustinian friary at Wittenberg, only the bathroom, but **usually also the living room.**

The dress of the people was far more various and picturesque than nowadays. Both sexes dressed in gaudy colors and delighted in strange fashions, so that, as Roger Ascham said, "he thought himself most brave that was most monstrous in disorder." For women the fashion of décolleté was just coming in, as so many fashions do, from the demi-monde. To Catherine de' Medici is attributed the invention of the corset, an atrocity to be excused only by her own **urgent need of one.**

The day began at five in summer and at seven in winter. A heavy breakfast was followed by a heavier dinner at ten, and supper at five, and there were between times two or three other tiffins or "drinkings." The staple food was meat and cereal; very few of our vegetables were known, though some were just beginning to be cultivated. The most valuable article of food introduced from the new world was the potato. Another importation that did not become thoroughly acclimatized in Europe was the turkey. Even now they are rare, but there are several interesting allusions to them in the literature of that time, one of the year 1533 in Luther's table talk. Poultry of other sorts was common, as were eggs, game and fish. The cooking relied for its highest effects on sugar and

spices. The ordinary fruits—apples, cherries and oranges—furnished a wholesome and pleasing variety to the table. Knives and spoons were used in eating, but forks were unknown, at least in northern Europe.

All the victuals were washed down with copious potations. A water-drinker, like Sir Thomas More, was the rarest of exceptions. The poor drank chiefly beer and ale; the mildest sort, known as "small beer," was recommended to the man suffering from too strong drink of the night before. Wine was more prized, and there were a number of varieties. There being no champagne, Burgundy was held in high esteem, as were some of the strong, sweet, Spanish and Portuguese wines. The most harmless drinks were claret and Rhine wine. There were some "mixed drinks," such as sack or hippocras, in which beer or wine was sophisticated with eggs, spices and sugar. The quantities habitually drunk were large. Roger Ascham records that Charles V drank the best he ever saw, never less than a quart at a draft. The breakfast table of an English nobleman was set out with a quart of wine and a quart of beer, liquor then taking the place of tea, coffee, chocolate and all the "soft" beverages that now furnish stimulation and sociability.

"In these times," wrote Harrison, "the taking-in of the smoke of an Indian herb called 'Tobaco' by an instrument formed like a little ladle . . . is greatly taken up and used in England against rewmes [colds] and some other diseases." Like other drugs, tobacco soon came to be used as a narcotic for its own sake, and was presently celebrated as "divine tobacco" and "our holy herb nicotian" by the poets. What, indeed, are smoking, drinking, and other wooings of pure sensation at the sacrifice of power and reason, but a sort of pragmatized poetry? Some ages, and those the most poetical, like that of Pericles and that of Rabelais, have deified intoxication and sensuality; others, markedly our own, have preferred the accumulation of wealth and knowledge to sensual indulgence. It is a psychological contrast of importance.

Could we be suddenly transported on Mr. Wells's time machine four hundred years back we should be less struck



by what our ancestors had than by what they lacked. Quills took the place of fountain pens, pencils, typewriters and dictaphones. Not only was postage dearer but there were no telephones or telegrams to supplement it. The world's news of yesterday, which we imbibe with our morning cup, then sifted down slowly through various media of communication, mostly oral. It was two months after the battle before Philip of Spain knew the fate of his own Armada. The houses had no steam heat, no elevators; the busy housewife was aided by no vacuum cleaner, sewing machine and gas ranges; the business man could not ride to his office, nor the farmer to his market, in automobiles. There were neither railways nor steamships to make travel rapid and luxurious.

Nevertheless, journeys for purposes of piety, pleasure and business were common. Pilgrimages to Jerusalem, Rome, Compostella, Loretto, Walsingham and many other shrines were frequent in Catholic countries. Students were perpetually wandering from one university to another; merchants were on the road, and gentlemen felt the attractions of sight-seeing. The cheap and common mode of locomotion was on foot. Boats on the rivers and horses on land furnished the alternatives. The roads were so poor that the horses were sometimes "almost shipwrecked." The trip from Worms to Rome commonly took twelve days, but could be made in seven. Xavier's voyage from Lisbon to Goa took thirteen months. Inns were good in France and England; less pleasant elsewhere. Erasmus particularly abominated the German inns, where a large living and dining room would be heated to a high temperature by a stove around which travelers would dry their steaming garments. The smells caused by these operations, together with the fleas and mice with which the poorer inns were infested, made the stay anything but luxurious. Any complaint was met by the retort, "If you don't like it, go somewhere else," a usually impracticable alternative. When the traveller was escorted to his bedroom, he found it very cold in winter, though the featherbeds kept him warm enough. He would see his chamber filled with other beds occupied by his travelling companions of both sexes, and he himself was often forced to share his bed with a stranger.



The custom of the time was to take one bath a week. For this there were public bathhouses, frequented by both sexes. A common form of entertainment was the "bath-party."

With the same insatiable gusto that they displayed in other matters the contemporaries of Luther and Shakespeare went in for amusements. Never has the theater been more popular. Many sports, like bear-baiting and bull-baiting, were cruel. Hunting was also much relished, though humane men like Luther and More protested against the "silly and woeful beastes' slaughter and murder." Tennis was so popular that there were 250 courts in Paris alone. The game was different from the modern in that the courts were 121 feet long, instead of 78 feet, and the wooden balls and "bats"—as racquets are still called in England—were much harder. Cards and dice were passionately played, a game called "triumph" or "trump" being the ancestor of our whist. Chess was played nearly as now.

Young people loved dances and some older people shook their heads over them, then as now. Melanchthon danced, at the age of forty-four, and Luther approved of such parties, properly chaperoned, as a means of bringing young people together. On the other hand dances were regulated in many states and prohibited in others, like Zurich and Geneva. Some of the dances were quite stately, like the minuet, others were boisterous romps, in which the girls were kissed, embraced and whirled around giddily by their partners. The Scotch ambassador's comment that Queen Elizabeth "danced very high" gives an impression of agility that would hardly now be considered in the best taste.

The veneer of courtesy was thin. True, humanists, publicists and authors composed for each other eulogies that would have been hyperboles if addressed to the morning stars singing at the dawn of creation, but once a quarrel had been started among the touchy race of writers and a spouting geyser of inconceivable scurrility burst forth. No imagery was too nasty, no epithet too strong, no charge too base to bring against an opponent. The heroic examples of Greek and Roman invective paled before the inexhaustible resources of learned billingsgate stored in the minds of the humanists

and theologians. To accuse an enemy of atheism and heresy was a matter of course; to add charges of unnatural vice or, if he were dead, stories of suicide and of the devils hovering greedily over his deathbed, was extremely common. Even crowned heads exchanged similar amenities.

Withal, there was growing up a strong appreciation of the merits of courtesy. Was not Bayard, the captain in the army of Francis I a "knight without fear and without reproach"? Did not Sir Philip Sidney do one of the perfect deeds of gentleness when, dying on the battle field and tortured with thirst, he passed his cup of water to a common soldier with the simple words, "Thy need is greater than mine"? One of the most justly famous and most popular books of the sixteenth century was Baldessare Castiglione's *Book of the Courtier*, called by Dr. Johnson the best treatise on good breeding ever written. Published in Italian in 1528, it was translated into Spanish in 1534, into French in 1537, into English and Latin in 1561, and finally into German in 1566. There have been of it more than 140 editions. It sets forth an ideal of a Prince Charming, a man of noble birth, expert in games and in war, brave, modest, unaffected, witty, an elegant speaker, a good dancer, familiar with literature and accomplished in music, as well as a man of honor and courtesy. It is significant that this ideal appealed to the time, though it must be confessed it was rarely reached. Ariosto, to whom the first book was dedicated by the author, depicts, as his ideals, knights in whom the sense of honor has completely replaced all Christian virtues. They were always fighting each other about their loves, much like the bulls, lions, rams and dogs to whom the poet continually compares them. Even the women were hardly safe in their company.

Sometimes a brief anecdote will stamp a character as no long description will do. The following are typical of the manners of our forbears:

One winter morning a stately matron was ascending the steps of the church of St. Gudule at Brussels. They were covered with ice; she slipped and took a precipitate and involuntary seat. In the anguish of the moment, a single word, of mere obscenity, escaped her lips. When the laugh-

ing bystanders, among whom was Erasmus, helped her to her feet, she beat a hasty retreat, crimson with shame. Nowadays ladies do not have such a vocabulary at their tongue's end.

The Spanish ambassador Enriquez de Toledo was at Rome calling on Imperia de Cugnatis, a lady who, though of the demi-monde, lived like a princess, cultivated letters and art, and had many poets as well as many nobles among her friends. Her floors were carpeted with velvet rugs, her walls hung with golden cloth, and her tables loaded with costly bric-à-brac. The Spanish courtier suddenly turned and spat copiously in the face of his lackey and then explained to the slightly startled company that he chose this objective rather than soil the splendor he saw around him. The disgusting act passed for a delicate and successful flattery.

Among the students at Wittenberg was a certain Simon Lemchen, or Lemnius, a lewd fellow of the baser sort who published two volumes of scurrilous epigrams bringing unfounded and nasty charges against Luther, Melanchthon and the other Reformers and their wives. When he fled the city before he could be arrested, Luther revenged himself partly by a Catilinarian sermon, partly by composing, for circulation among his friends, some verses about Lemnius in which the scurrility and obscenity of the offending youth were well over-trumped. One would be surprised at similar measures taken by a professor of divinity today.

In measuring the morals of a given epoch statistics are not applicable; or, at any rate, it is probably true that the general impression one gets of the moral tone of any period is more trustworthy than would be got from carefully compiled figures. And that one does get such an impression, and a very strong one, is undeniable. Everyone has in his mind a more or less distinct idea of the ethical standards of ancient Athens, of Rome, of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, the Puritan Commonwealth, the Restoration, the Victorian Age.

The sixteenth century was a time when morals were perhaps not much worse than they are now, but when vice and crime were more flaunted and talked about. Puritanism and prudery have nowadays done their best to conceal the cor-

ruption and indecency beneath the surface. But our ancestors had no such delicacy. The naïve frankness of the age, both when it gloried in the flesh and when it reproved sin, gives a full-blooded complexion to that time that is lacking now. The large average consumption of alcohol—a certain irritant to moral maladies—and the unequal administration of justice, with laws at once savage and corruptly dispensed, must have had bad consequences.

The Reformation had no permanent discernible effect on moral standards. Accompanied as it often was with a temporary zeal for righteousness, it was too often followed by a breaking up of conventional standards and an emphasis on dogma at the expense of character, that operated badly. Latimer thought that the English Reformation had been followed by a wave of wickedness. Luther said that when the devil of the papacy had been driven out, seven other devils entered to take its place, and that at Wittenberg a man was considered quite a saint who could say that he had not broken the first commandment, but only the other nine. Much of this complaint must be set down to disappointment at not reaching perfection, and over against it may be set many testimonies to the moral benefits assured by the reform.

It was an age of violence. Murder was common everywhere. On the slightest provocation a man of spirit was expected to whip out a rapier or dagger and plunge it into his insulter. The murder of unfaithful wives was an especial point of honor. Benvenuto Cellini boasts of several assassinations and numerous assaults, and he himself got off without a scratch from the law, Pope Paul III graciously protesting that "men unique in their profession, like Benvenuto, were not subject to the laws." The number of unique men must have been large in the Holy City, for in 1497 a citizen testified that he had seen more than a hundred bodies of persons foully done to death thrown into the Tiber, and no one bothered about it.

Brigandage stalked unabashed through the whole of Europe. By 1585 the number of bandits in the papal states alone had risen to 27,000. Sixtus V took energetic means to repress them. One of his stratagems is too characteristic to

omit mentioning. He had a train of mules loaded with poisoned food and then drove them along a road he knew to be infested by highwaymen, who, as he had calculated, actually took them and ate of the food, of which many died.

Other countries were perhaps less scourged by robbers, but none was free. Erasmus's praise of Henry VIII, in 1519, for having cleared his realm of freebooters, was premature. In the wilder parts, especially on the Scotch border, they were still rife. In 1529 the Armstrongs of Lidderdale, just over the border, could boast that they had burned 52 churches, besides making heavy depredations on private property. When James V took stern measures to suppress them, and instituted a College of Justice for that purpose, the good law was unpopular.

Bands of old soldiers and new recruits wandered through France, Spain and the Netherlands. The worst robbers in Germany were the free knights. From their picturesque castles they emerged to pillage peaceful villages and trains of merchandise going from one walled city to another. In doing so they inflicted wanton mutilations on the unfortunate merchants whom they regarded as their natural prey. Even the greatest of them, like Francis von Sickingen, were not ashamed to "let their horses bite off travellers' purses" now and then. But it was not only the nobles who became gentlemen of the road. A well-to-do merchant of Berlin, named John Kohlhasse, was robbed of a couple of horses by a Saxon squire, and, failing to get redress in the corrupt courts, threw down the gauntlet to the whole of Electoral Saxony in a proclamation that he would rob, burn and take reprisals until he was given compensation for his loss. For six years he maintained himself as a highwayman, but was finally taken and executed in Brandenburg.

Fraud of all descriptions was not less rampant than force. When Machiavelli reduced to a reasoned theory the practice of all hypocrisy and guile, the courts of Europe were only too ready to listen to his advice. In fact, they carried their mutual attempts at deception to a point that was not only harmful to themselves, but ridiculous, making it a principle to violate oaths and to debase the currency of good faith in



every possible way. There was also much untruth in private life. Unfortunately, lying in the interests of piety was justified by Luther, while the Jesuits made a soul-rotting art of equivocation.

The standard of sexual purity was disturbed by a reaction against the asceticism of the Middle Ages. Luther proclaimed that chastity was impossible, while the humanists gloried in the flesh. Public opinion was not scandalized by prostitution; learned men occasionally debated whether fornication was a sin, and the Italians now began to call a harlot a "courteous woman" (courtesan) as they called an assassin a "brave man" (bravo). Augustine had said that harlots were remedies against worse things, and the church had not only winked at brothels, but frequently licensed them herself. Bastardy was no bar to hereditary right in Italy.

The Reformers tried to make a clean sweep of the "social evil." Under Luther's direction brothels were closed in the reformed cities. When this was done at Strassburg the women drew up a petition, stating that they had pursued their profession not from liking but only to earn bread, and asked for honest work. Serious attempts were made to give it to them, or to get them husbands. At Zurich and some other cities the brothels were left open, but were put under the supervision of an officer who was to see that no married men frequented them. The reformers had a strange ally in the growing fear of venereal diseases. Other countries followed Germany in their war on the prostitute. In London the public houses of ill fame were closed in 1546, in Paris in 1560. An edict of July 23, 1566 commanded all prostitutes to leave Rome, but when 25,000 persons, including the women and their dependents, left the city, the loss of public revenue induced the pope to allow them to return on August 17 of the same year.

One of the striking aberrations of the sixteenth century, as it seems to us, was the persistent advocacy of polygamy as, if not desirable in itself, at least preferable to divorce. Divorce or annulment of marriage was not hard to obtain by people of influence, whether Catholic or Protestant, but it was a more difficult matter than it is in America now. In



Scotland there was indeed a sort of trial marriage, known as "handfasting," by which the parties might live together for a year and a day and then continue as married or separate. But, beginning with Luther, many of the Reformers thought polygamy less wrong than divorce, on the biblical ground that whereas the former had been practised in the Old Testament times and was not clearly forbidden by the New Testament, divorce was prohibited save for adultery. Luther advanced this thesis as early as 1520, when it was purely theoretical, but he did not shrink from applying it on occasion. It is extraordinary what a large body of reputable opinion was prepared to tolerate polygamy, at least in exceptional cases. Popes, theologians, humanists like Erasmus, and philosophers like Bruno, all thought a plurality of wives a natural condition.

But all the while the instincts of the masses were sounder in this respect than the precepts of their guides. While polygamy remained a freakish and exceptional practice, the passions of the age were absorbed to a high degree by monogamous marriage. Matrimony having been just restored to its proper dignity as the best estate for man, its praises were sounded highly. The church, indeed, remained true to her preference for celibacy, but the Inquisition found much business in suppressing the then common opinion that marriage was better than virginity. To the Reformers marriage was not only the necessary condition of happiness to mankind, but the typically holy estate in which God's service could best be done. From all sides paeans arose celebrating matrimony as the true remedy for sin and also as the happiest estate. The delights of wedded love are celebrated equally in Luther's table talk and letters and in the poems of the Italian humanist Pontano. "I have always been of the opinion," writes Ariosto, "that without a wife at his side no man can attain perfect goodness or live without sin." "In marriage there is one mind in two bodies," says Henry Cornelius Agrippa, "one harmony, the same sorrows, the same joys, an identical will, common riches, poverty and honors, the same bed and the same table. . . . Only a husband and wife can love each other infinitely and serve each

other as long as both do live, for no love is either so vehement or so holy as theirs."

The passion for marriage in itself is witnessed by the practice of widows and widowers of remarrying as soon and as often as possible. Luther's friend, Justus Jonas, married thrice, each time with a remark to the effect that it was better to marry than to burn. The English Bishop Richard Cox excused his second marriage, at an advanced age, by an absurd letter lamenting that he had not the gift of chastity. Willibrandis Rosenblatt married in succession Louis Keller, Oecolampadius, Capito and Bucer, the ecclesiastical eminence of her last three husbands giving her, one would think, an almost official position. Sir Thomas More married a second wife just one month after his first wife's death.

Sad to relate, the wives so necessary to men's happiness were frequently ill treated after they were won. In the sixteenth century women were still treated as minors; if married they could make no will; their husbands could beat them with impunity, for cruelty was no cause for divorce. Sir Thomas More's home-life is lauded by Erasmus as a very paragon, because "he got more compliance from his wife by jokes and blandishments than most husbands by imperious harshness." One of these jokes, a customary one, was that his wife was neither pretty nor young; one of the "blandishments," I suppose, was an epigram by Sir Thomas to the effect that though a wife was a heavy burden she might be useful if she would die and leave her husband money. In Utopia, he assures us, husbands chastise their wives.

In the position of women various currents crossed each other. The old horror of the temptress, inherited from the early church, the lofty scorn exhibited by the Greek philosophers, mingled with strands of chivalry and a still newer appreciation of the real dignity of woman and of her equal powers. Ariosto treated women like spoiled children; the humanists delighted to rake up the old jibes at them in musty authors; the divines were hardest of all in their judgment. "Nature doth paint them forth," says John Knox of women, "to be weak, frail, impatient, feeble and foolish, and experience hath declared them to be unconstant, variable,

cruel and void of the spirit of council and regimen." "If women bear children until they become sick and eventually die," preaches Luther, "that does no harm. Let them bear children till they die of it; that is what they are for." In 1595 the question was debated at Wittenberg as to whether women were human beings. The general tone was one of disparagement. An anthology might be made of the proverbs recommending (à la Nietzsche) the whip as the best treatment for the sex.

But withal there was a certain chivalry that revolted against all this brutality. Castiglione champions courtesy and kindness to women on the highest and most beautiful ground, the spiritual value of woman's love. Ariosto sings:

No doubt they are accurst and past all grace  
That dare to strike a damsel in the face,  
Or of her head to minish but a hair.

Certain works like T. Elyot's *Defence of Good Women* and like Cornelius Agrippa's *Nobility and Excellence of the Female Sex*, witness a genuine appreciation of woman's worth. Some critics have seen in the last named work a paradox, like the *Praise of Folly*, such as was dear to the humanists. To me it seems absolutely sincere, even when it goes so far as to proclaim that woman is as superior to man as man is to beast and to celebrate her as the last and supreme work of the creation.

The family was far larger, on the average, in the sixteenth century than it is now. One can hardly think of any man in this generation with as many as a dozen children; it is possible to mention several of that time with over twenty. Anthony Koberger, the famous Nuremberg printer had twenty-five children, eight by his first and seventeen by his second wife. Albert Dürer was the third of eighteen children of the same couple, of whom apparently only three reached maturity. John Colet, born in 1467, was the eldest of twenty-two brothers and sisters of whom by 1499 he was the only survivor. Of course these families were exceptional, but not

glaringly so. A brood of six to twelve was a very common occurrence.

Children were brought up harshly in many families, strictly in almost all. They were not expected to sit in the presence of their parents, unless asked, or to speak unless spoken to. They must needs bow and crave a blessing twice a day. Lady Jane Grey complained that if she did not do everything as perfectly as God made the world, she was bitterly taunted and presently so nipped and pinched by her noble parents that she thought herself in hell. The rod was much resorted to. And yet there was a good deal of natural affection. Few fathers have ever been better to their babies than was Luther, and he humanely advised others to rely as much on reward as on punishment—on the apple as on the switch—and above all not to chastise the little ones so harshly as to make them **fear or hate their parents.**

The *patria potestas* was supposed to extend, as it did in Rome, during the adult as during the callow years. Especially did public opinion insist on children marrying according to the wishes of their parents. Among the nobility child-marriage was common, a mere form, of course, not at once followed by cohabitation. A betrothal was a very solemn thing, amounting to a definite contract. Perfect liberty was allowed the engaged couple, by law in Sweden and by custom in many other countries. All the more necessary, in the opinion of the time, to prevent youths and maidens betrothing themselves without their parents' consent.

Probably the standard of health is now higher than it was then, and the average longevity greater. It is true that few epidemics have ever been more fatal than the recent influenza; and on the other hand one can point to plenty of examples of sixteenth-century men who reached a crude and green old age. Statistics were then few and unreliable. In 1905 the death-rate in London was 15.6 per thousand; in the years 1861-1880 it averaged 23 per thousand. It has been calculated that this is just what the death-rate was in London in a healthy year under Elizabeth, but it must be remembered that a year without some sort of epidemic was almost exceptional.

Bubonic plague was pandemic at that time, and horribly fatal. Many of the figures given—as that 200,000 people perished in Moscow in 1570, 50,000 at Lyons in 1572, and 50,000 at Venice during the years 1575-7, must be gross exaggerations, but they give a vivid idea of the popular idea of the prevalent mortality. Another scourge was the sweating sickness, first noticed as epidemic in 1485 and returning in 1507, 1517, 1528 and 1551. Tuberculosis was probably as wide-spread in the sixteenth as it is in the twentieth century, but it figured less prominently on account of worse diseases and because it was seldom recognized until the last stages. Smallpox was common, unchecked as it was by vaccination, and with it were confounded a variety of zymotic diseases, such as measles, which only began to be recognized as different in the course of the sixteenth century. One disease almost characteristic of former ages, so much more prevalent was it in them, due to the more unwholesome food and drink, was the stone.

Venereal diseases became so prominent in the sixteenth century that it has often been thought that the syphilis was imported from America. This, however, has been denied by authorities who believe that it came down from classical antiquity, but that it was not differentiated from other scourges. The Latin name *variola*, like the English pox, was applied indiscriminately to syphilis, small-pox, chicken-pox, etc. Gonorrhea was also common. The spread of these diseases was assisted by many causes besides the prevalent moral looseness; by lack of cleanliness in public baths, for example.

Useless to go through the whole roster of the plagues. Suffice it to say that whatever now torments poor mortals, from tooth-ache to cold in the head, and from rheumatism to lunacy, was known to our ancestors in aggravated forms. Deleterious was the use of alcohol, the evils of which were so little understood that it was actually prescribed for many disorders of which it is a certain irritant. Add to this the lack of sanitary measures, not only of disinfection but of common cleanliness, and the etiology of the phenomena is satisfactorily accounted for.



If even now medicine as a science and an art seems backward compared with surgery, it has nevertheless made considerable advances since it began to be empirical. In the Middle Ages it was almost purely dogmatic; men did not ask their eyes and minds what was the nature of the human body and the effect of this or that drug on it, they asked Aristotle, or Hippocrates, or Galen or Avicenna. The chief rivalries, and they were bitter, were between the Greek and the Arabian schools. Galenism finally triumphed just before the beginnings of experiment and research were made. The greatest name in the first half of the century was that of Theophrastus Paracelsus, as arrant a quack as ever lived, but one who did something to break up the strangle-hold of tradition. He worked out his system *a priori* from a fantastic postulate of the parallelism between man and the universe, the microcosm and the macrocosm. He held that the Bible gave valuable prescriptions, as in the treatment of wounds by oil and wine.

Under the leadership of Ambroise Paré surgery improved rather more than medicine. Without anaesthetics, indeed, operations were difficult, but a good deal was accomplished. Paré first made amputation on a large scale possible by inventing a ligature for large arteries that effectively controlled hemorrhage. This barber's apprentice, who despised the schools and wrote in the vernacular, made other important improvements in the surgeon's technique. It is noteworthy that each discovery was treated as a trade secret to be exploited for the benefit of a few practitioners and not given freely to the good of mankind.

In obstetrics Paré also made discoveries that need not be detailed here. Until his time it was almost universal for women to be attended in childbirth only by midwives of their own sex. Indeed, so strong was the prejudice on this point that women were known to die of abdominal tumors rather than allow male physicians to examine them. The admission of men to the profession of midwife marked a considerable improvement in method.

The treatment of lunacy was inept. The poor patients were whipped or otherwise tormented for alluding to the subject



of their monomania. Our ancestors found fun in watching the antics of crazed minds, and made up parties to go to Bedlams and tease the insane. Indeed, some of the scenes in Shakespeare's plays, in which madness is depicted, and which seem tragic to us, probably had a comic value for the groundlings before whom the plays were first produced.

As early as 1510 Luther saw one of the hospitals at Florence. He tells how beautiful they were, how clean and well served by honorable matrons tending the poor freely all day without making known their names and at night returning home. Such institutions were the glory of Italy, for they were sadly to seek in other lands. When they were finally established elsewhere, they were too often left to the care of ignorant and evil menials. The stories one may read of the Hôtel-Dieu, at Paris, are fairly hair-raising.

## Chapter 2

### The Capitalistic Revolution

#### § 1. The Rise of the Power of Money

PARALLEL WITH the Reformation was taking place an economic revolution even deeper and more enduring in its consequences. Both Reformation and Revolution were manifestations of the individualistic spirit of the age; the substitution, in the latter case, of private enterprise and competition for common effort as a method of producing wealth and of distributing it. Both were prepared for long before they actually upset the existing order; both have taken several centuries to unfold their full consequences, and in each the truly decisive steps were taken in the sixteenth century.

It is doubtless incorrect to see either in the Reformation or in the economic revolution a direct and simple cause of the other. They interacted and to a certain extent joined forces; but to a greater degree each sought to use the other, and each has at times been credited, or blamed, with the results of the other's operations. Contemporaries noticed the effects, mostly the bad effects, of the rise of capitalism, and often mistakenly attributed them to the Reformation; and the new kings of commerce were only too ready to hide behind the mask of Protestantism while despoiling the church. Like other historical forces, while easily separable in thought, the two movements were usually inextricably interwoven in action.

Capitalism supplanted gild-production because of its fitness as a social instrument for the production and storing of wealth. In competition with capital the medieval communism succumbed in one line of business after another—in banking, in trade, in mining, in industry and finally in agriculture—because it was unable to produce the results that capital produced. By the vast reward that the newer system gave to individual enterprise, to technical improvement and to investment, capitalism proved the aptest tool for the creation

and preservation of wealth ever devised. It is true that the manifold multiplication of riches in the last four centuries is due primarily to inventions for the exploitation of natural resources, but the capitalistic method is ideally fitted for the utilization of these new discoveries and for laying up of their increment for ultimate social use. And this is an inestimable service to any society. Only a fairly rich people can afford the luxuries of beauty, knowledge, and power, that enhance the value of life and allow it to climb to ever greater heights. To balance this service, it must be taken into account that capitalism has lamentably failed justly to distribute rewards. Its tendency is to intercept the greater part of the wealth it creates for the benefit of a single class, and thereby to rob the rest of the community of their due dividend.

So delicate is the adjustment of society that an apparently trivial new factor will often upset the whole equilibrium and produce the most incalculable results. Thus, the primary cause of the capitalistic revolution appears to have been a purely mechanical one, the increase in the production of the precious metals. Wealth could not be stored at all in the Middle Ages save in the form of specie; nor without it could large commerce be developed, nor large industry financed, nor was investment possible. Moreover the rise of prices consequent on the increase of the precious metals gave a powerful stimulus to manufacture and a fillip to the merchant and to the entrepreneur such as they have rarely received before or since. It was, in short, the development of the power of money that gave rise to the money power.

In the earlier Middle Ages there prevailed a "natural economy," or system in which payments were made chiefly in the form of services and by barter; this gave place very gradually to our modern "money economy" in which gold and silver are both the normal standards of value and the sole instruments of exchange. Already in the twelfth century money was being used in the towns of Western Europe; not until the late fourteenth or fifteenth did it become a dominant factor in rural life. This change was not the great revolution itself, but was the indispensable prerequisite of it, and in large part its direct cause.

Gold and silver could now be hoarded in the form of money, and so the first step was taken in the formation of large fortunes, known to the ancient world, but almost absent in the Middle Ages. The first great fortunes were made by kings, by nobles with large landed estates, and by officers in government service. Henry VII left a large fortune to his son. Some of the popes and some of the princes of Germany and Italy hoarded money even when they were paying interest on a debt,—a testimony to the increasing estimate of the value of hard cash. The chief nobles were scarcely behind the kings in accumulating treasure. Their vast revenues from land were much more like government imposts than like rents. Thus Montmorency in France gave his daughter a dowry amounting to \$420,000. The duke of Gandia in Spain owned estates peopled by 60,000 Moriscos and yielding a princely revenue. Vast ransoms were exacted in war, and fines, confiscation and pillage filled the coffers of the lords. After the atrocious war against the Moriscos, the duke of Lerma sold their houses on his estates for 500,000 ducats.

In the monarchies of Europe the only avenue to wealth at first open to private men was the government service. Offices, benefices, naval and military commands, were bought with the expectation, often justified, of making money out of them. The farmed revenues yielded immense profit to the collectors. No small fortunes were reaped by Empson and Dudley, the tools of Henry VII, but they were far surpassed by the hoards of Wolsey and of Cromwell. Such was the great fortune made in France by Semblançay, the son of a plain merchant of Tours, who turned the offices of treasurer and superintendent of finances to such good account that he bought himself large estates and baronies. Fortunes on a proportionately smaller scale were made by the servants of the German princes, as by John Schenitz, a minion of the Archbishop Elector Albert of Mayence. So insecure was the tenure of riches accumulated in royal or princely service that most of the men who did so, including all those mentioned in this paragraph, ended on the scaffold, save, indeed, Wolsey, who would have done so had he not died while awaiting trial.

It is to be noted that, though land was the principal form of wealth in the Middle Ages, no great fortunes were made from it at the beginning of the capitalistic era, save by the titled holders of enormous domains. The small landlords suffered at the expense of the burghers in Germany, and not until these burghers turned to the country and bought up landed estates did agriculture become thoroughly profitable.

The intimate connection of government and capitalism is demonstrated by the fact that, next to officials, government concessionaires and bankers were the first to make great fortunes. At this time banking was closely dependent on public loans and was therefore the first great business to be established on the capitalistic basis. The first "trust" was the money trust. Though banking had been well started in the Middle Ages, it was still in an imperfect state of development. Jews and goldsmiths made a considerable number of commercial loans but these loans were always regarded by the borrower as temporary expedients; the habitual conduct of business on borrowed capital was unknown. But, just as the new output of the German mines was increasing the supply of precious metals, the greater costliness of war, due to the substitution of mercenaries and fire-arms for feudal levies equipped with bows and pikes, made the governments of Europe need money more than ever before. They made great loans at home and abroad, and it was the interest on these that expanded the banking business until it became an international power. Well before the sixteenth century men had made a fine art of receiving deposits, loaning capital and performing other financial operations, but it was not until the late fifteenth century that the bankers reaped the full reward of their skill and of the new opportunities. The three balls in the arms of the Medici testify to the heights to which a profession, once humble, might raise its experts. In Italy the science of accounting, or of double-entry book-keeping, originated; it was slowly adopted in other lands. The first English work on the subject is that by John Gouge in 1543, entitled: "A Profitable Treatyce called the Instrument or Booke to learn to know the good order of the keeping of the famouse reconnynges, called in Latin, Dare et



Habere, and, in Englyshe, Debitor and Creditor." It was in Italy that modern technique of clearing bills was developed; the simple system by which balances are settled not by full payment of each debt in money, but by comparing the paper certificates of indebtedness. This immense saving, as developed by the Genoese, was soon extended from their own city to the whole of Northern Italy, so that the bankers would meet several times a year in the first international clearing-house. From Genoa the same system was then applied to distant cities, with great profit, even more in security than in saving of capital. If bills payable at Antwerp were bought at Genoa, they were paid at Antwerp by selling bills on Lisbon, perhaps, and these in turn by selling exchange on Genoa. These processes seem simple and are now universal, but how vastly they facilitated the development of banking and business when first discovered can hardly be over-estimated.

From the improvement of exchange the Genoese soon proceeded to arbitrage, a transaction more profitable and more socially useful at that time when poor communications made the differences in prices between bills of exchange, bullion, coins, stocks and bonds in distant markets more considerable than they are now. The Genoese bankers also invented the first substitutes for money in the form of circulating notes. In all this, and in other ways, they made enormous profits that soon induced others to copy them.

Though the Italians invented modern banking they were eventually surpassed by the Germans, if not in technique at least in the size of the firms established. The largest Florentine bank in 1529 was that of Thomas Guadagni with a capital of 520,000 florins (\$1,170,000). The capital of the house of Fugger at Augsburg, distinct from the personal fortunes of its members, was in 1546, 4,700,000 gold gulden (\$11,500,000). The average annual profits of the Fuggers during the years 1511-27 were 54.5 per cent.; from 1534-6, 2.2 per cent.; from 1540-46, 19 per cent.; from 1547-53, 5.6 per cent. Another Augsburg firm, the Welsers, averaged 9 per cent. for the fifteen years 1502-17. Dividends were not declared annually, but a general casting up of accounts was



made every few years and a new balance struck, each partner withdrawing as much as he wished, or leaving it to be credited to his account as new capital.

Though the Fuggers and other firms soon went into large business of all sorts, they remained primarily bankers. As such they enjoyed boundless credit with the public from whom they received deposits at regular interest. The proportion of these deposits to the capital continually rose. This general tendency, together with the habit of changing the amount of capital every few years, is evident from the following table of the liabilities of the Fuggers in gold gulden at several different periods:

<i>Year</i>	<i>Capital</i>	<i>Deposits</i>
1527 .....	2,000,000	290,000
1536 .....	1,500,000	900,000
1546 .....	4,700,000	1,300,000
1563 .....	2,000,000	3,100,000
1577 .....	1,300,000	4,000,000

A smaller Augsburg firm, the Haugs, had in 1560, a capital of 140,000 florins and deposits of 648,000. As all these deposits were subject to be withdrawn at sight, and as the firms usually kept a very small reserve of specie, it would seem that banking was subject to great risks. The unsoundness of the method was counterbalanced by the fact that most of the deposits were made by members of the banker's family, or by friends, who harbored a strong sentiment against embarrassing the bank by withdrawing at inconvenient seasons. Doubtless the almost uniformly profitable career of most firms for many years concealed many dangers.

The crash came finally as the result of the bankruptcy of the Spanish and French governments. Spain's repudiation of her debt was partial, taking the form of consolidation and conversion; France, however, simply stopped all payments of interest and amortization. Many banks throughout Europe failed, and drew down with them their creditors. The years 1557-64 saw the first of these characteristically modern phenomena, international financial crises. There were hard times everywhere. Other states followed the example of the

French and Spanish governments, England constituting the fortunate exception. Recovery followed at length, however, and speculation boomed; but a second Spanish state bankruptcy brought on another crisis, and there was a third, following the defeat of the Armada. The failure of many of the great private companies was followed by the institution of state banks. The first to be erected was the Banco di Rialto in Venice.

The banks were the agencies for the spread of the capitalistic system to other fields. The great firms either bought up, or obtained as concessions from some government, the natural resources requisite for the production of wealth. One of the very first things seized by them were the mines. Indeed, the profitable exploitation of the German mines especially dates from their acquisition by the Fuggers and other bankers late in the fifteenth century. Partly by the development of new methods of refining ore, but chiefly by driving large numbers of laborers to their maximum effort, the new mine-owners increased the production of metal almost at a bound, and thereby poured untold wealth into their own coffers. The total value of metals produced in Germany in 1525 amounted to \$4,800,000 per annum, and employed over 100,000 men. Until 1545 the German production of silver was greater than the American, and copper was almost as valuable a product. Notwithstanding its increased production, its value doubled between 1527 and 1557. The shares in these great companies were, like the "Fugger letters," or certificates of interest-bearing deposits in banks, assignable and were actively traded in on various bourses. Each share was a certificate of partnership which then carried with it unlimited liability for the debts of the company. One of the favorite speculative issues was found in the shares of the Mansfeld Copper Co., established in 1524 with a capital of 70,000 gulden, which was increased to 120,000 gulden in 1528.

Whereas, in banking and in mining, capital had almost created the opportunities for its employment, in commerce it partly supplanted the older system and partly entered into new paths. In the Middle Ages domestic, and to some ex-

tent international, commerce was carried on by fairs adapted to bring producer and consumer together and hence reduce the functions of middleman to the narrowest limits. Such was the annual fair at Stourbridge; such the famous book-mart at Frankfort-on-the-Main, and such were the fairs in Lyons, Antwerp, and many other cities. Only in the larger towns was a market perpetually open. Foreign commerce was also carried on by companies formed on the analogy of the medieval gilds.

New conditions called for fresh means of meeting them. The great change in sea-borne trade effected by the discovery of the new routes to India and America, was not so much in the quantity of goods carried as in the paths by which they traveled. The commerce of the two inland seas, the Mediterranean and the Baltic, relatively declined, while that of the Atlantic seaboard grew by leaps and bounds. New and large companies came into existence, formed on the joint-stock principle. Over them the various governments exercised a large control, giving them a semi-political character.

As Portugal was the first to tap the wealth of the gorgeous East, into her lap fell the stream of gold from that quarter. The secret of her windfall was the small bulk and enormous value of her cargoes. From Malabar she fetched pepper and ginger, from Ceylon cinnamon and pearls, from Bengal opium, the only known conqueror of pain, and with it frankincense and indigo. Borneo supplied camphor, Amboyna nutmegs and mace, and two small islands, Temote and Tidor, offered cloves. These products sold for forty times as much in London or in Antwerp as they cost in the Orient. No wonder that wealth came in a gale of perfume to Lisbon. The cost of the ship and of the voyage, averaging two years from departure to return, was \$20,000, and any ship might bring back a cargo worth \$750,000. But the risks were great. Of the 104 ships that sailed from 1497-1506 only 72 returned. In the following century of about 800 Portuguese vessels engaged in the India trade nearly one-eighth were lost. Even the risk of loss in sailing from Lisbon to the ports of northern Europe was appreciable. The king of Portugal in-

sured ships on a voyage from Lisbon to Antwerp for a premium of six per cent.

Spain found the path towards the setting sun as golden as Portugal had found the reflection of his rising beams. At her height she had a thousand merchant galleons. The chief imports were the precious metals, but they were not the only ones. Cochineal, selling at \$370 a hundredweight in London, surpassed in value any spice from Celebes. Dye-wood, ebony, some drugs, nuts and a few other articles richly repaid importation. There was also a very considerable export trade. Cadiz and Seville sent to the Indies annually 2,240,000 gallons of wine, with quantities of oil, clothes and other necessities. Many ships, not only Spanish but Portuguese and English, were weighted with human flesh from Africa as heavily as Christian with his black load of sin, and in the case of Portugal, at least, the load almost sent its bearer to the City of Destruction.

But Spanish keels made other wakes than westward. To Flanders oil and wool were sent to be exchanged for manufactured wares, tapestries and books. Italy asked hides and dyes in return for her brocades, pearls and linen. The undoubtedly great extent of Spanish commerce even in places where it had no monopoly, is all the more remarkable in that it was at the first burdened by what in the end choked it, government regulation. Cadiz had the best harbor, but Seville was favored by the king; even ships allowed to unload at Cadiz could do so only on condition that their cargoes be transported directly to Seville. A particularly crushing tax was the alcabala, or 10 per cent. impost on all sales. Other import duties, royalties on metals, excise on food, monopolies, and petty regulations finally handicapped Spain's merchants so effectually that they fell behind those of other countries in the race for supremacy.

As the mariners of the Iberian peninsula drooped under the shackles of unwise laws, hardy sailors sprang into their places. Neither of the other Latin nations, however, was able to do so. The once proud supremacy of Venice and of Genoa was gone; the former sank as Lisbon rose and the latter, who held her own at least as a money market until

1540, was about that time surpassed, though she was never wholly superseded, by Antwerp. Italy exported wheat, flax, woad and other products, but chiefly by land routes or in foreign keels. Nor was France able to take any great part in maritime trade. Content with the freight brought her by other nations, she sent out few expeditions, and those few, like that of James Cartier, had no present result either in commerce or in colonies. Her greatest mart was Lyons, the fairs there being carefully fostered by the kings and being naturally favored by the growth of manufacture, while the maritime harbors either declined or at least gained nothing. For a few years La Rochelle batted on religious piracy, but that was all.

In no country is the struggle for existence between the medieval and the modern commercial methods plainer than in Germany. The trade of the Hanse towns failed to grow, partly for the reason that their merchants had not command of the fluid wealth that raised to pre-eminence the southern cities. There were, indeed, other causes for the decline of the Hanseatic Baltic trade. The discovery of new routes, especially the opening of Archangel on the White Sea, short-circuited the current that had previously flowed through the Kattegat and the Skager Rak. Moreover, the development of both wheat-growing and of commerce in the Netherlands and in England proved disastrous to the Hanse. The shores of the Baltic had at one time been the granary of Europe, but they suffered somewhat by the greater yield of the more intensive agriculture introduced at that time elsewhere. Even then their export continued to be considerable, though diverted from the northern to the southern ports of Europe. In 1563, for example, 6630 loads of grain were exported from Königsberg, and in 1573 7730 loads.

The Hanse towns lost their English trade in competition with the new companies there formed. A bitter diplomatic struggle was carried on by Henry VIII. The privileges to the Germans of the Steelyard confirmed and extended by him were abridged by his son, partly restored by Mary and again taken away by Elizabeth. The emperor, in agreement with the cities' senates, started retaliatory measures against



English merchants, endeavoring to assure the Hanse towns that they should at least "continue the ancient concord of their dear native country and the good Dutches that now presently inhabit it." He therefore ordered English merchants banished, against which Elizabeth protested.

While the North of Germany was suffering from its failure to adapt itself to new conditions, a power was rising in the South capable of levying tribute not only from the whole Empire but from the habitable earth. Among the merchant princes who, in Augsburg, in Nuremberg, in Strassburg, placed on their own brows the golden crown of riches, the Fuggers were both typical and supreme. James Fugger "the Rich," springing from a family already opulent, was one of those geniuses of finance that turn everything touched into gold. He carried on a large banking business, he loaned money to emperors and princes, he bought up mines and fitted out fleets, he re-organized great industries, he speculated in politics and religion. For the princes of the empire he farmed taxes; for the pope he sold indulgences at a 33 $\frac{1}{3}$  per cent. commission, and collected annates and other dues. In Hungary, in Spain, in Italy, in the New World, his agents were delving for money and skilfully diverting it into his coffers. He was also a pillar of the church and a philanthropist, founding a library at Augsburg and building model tenements for poor workers. He became the incarnation of a new Great Power, that of international finance. A contemporary chronicler says: "emperors, kings, princes and governors have sent ambassage unto him; the pope hath greeted him as his beloved son and hath embraced him; cardinals have risen before him. . . . He hath become the glory of the whole German land." His sons, Raymond, Anthony and Jerome, were raised by Charles V to the rank and privileges of counts, bannerets and barons.

Throughout the century corporations became less and less family partnerships and more and more impersonal or "soulless." They were semi-public, semi-private affairs, resting on special charters and actively promoted, not only in Germany but in England and other countries, by the emperor, king, or territorial prince. On the other hand the capital was



largely subscribed by private business men and the direction of the companies' affairs was left in their hands. Liability was unlimited.

In their methods many of the sixteenth century corporations were surprisingly "modern." Monopolies, corners, trusts and agreements to keep up prices flourished, notwithstanding constant legislation against them, as that against secret schedules of prices passed by the Diet of Nuremberg. Particularly noteworthy were the number of agreements to create a monopoly price in metals. Thus a ring of German mine-owners was formed artificially to raise the price of silver, a measure defended publicly on the ground that it enriched Germany at the expense of the foreigner. Another example was the formation of a tinning company under the patronage of Duke George of Saxony. It proposed agreements with its Bohemian rivals to fix the price of tin, but these usually failed even after a monopoly of Bohemian tin had been granted by Ferdinand to Conrad Mayr of Augsburg.

The immense difficulty of cornering any of the larger articles of commerce was not so well appreciated in the earlier time as it is now. Nothing is more instructive than the history of the mercury "trusts" of those years. When the competing companies owning mines at Idria in Carniola amalgamated for the purpose of enhancing the price of quicksilver, the attempt broke down by reason of the Spanish mines. Accordingly, one Ambrose Höchstetter of Augsburg conceived the ambitious project of cornering the whole supply of the world. As has happened so often since, the higher price brought forth a much larger quantity of the article than had been reckoned with, the so-called "invisible supply"; the corner broke down and Höchstetter failed with enormous liabilities of 800,000 gulden, and died in prison. The crash shook the financial world, but was nevertheless followed by still better planned and better financed efforts of the Fuggers to put the whole quicksilver product of the world into an international trust. These final attempts were more or less successful. Another ambitious scheme, which failed, was that of Conrad Rott of Augsburg to get a monopoly of pepper. He agreed to buy six hundred tons of pepper from

the king of Portugal one year and one thousand tons the next, at the rate of 680 ducats the ton, but even this failed to give him the desired monopoly.

Just as in our own memory the trusts have aroused popular hatred and have brought down on their heads many attempts, usually unsuccessful, of governments to deal with them, so at the beginning of the capitalistic era, intense unpopularity was the lot of the new commercial methods and their exponents. Monopolies were fiercely denounced in the contemporary German tracts and every Diet made some effort to deal with them. First of all the merchants had to meet not only the envy and prejudices of the old order, but the positive teachings of the church. The prohibition of usury, and the doctrine that every article had a just or natural price, barred the road of the early entrepreneur. Aquinas believed that no one should be allowed to make more money than he needed and that profits on commerce should be scaled down to such a point that they would give only a reasonable return. This idea was shared by Catholic and Protestant alike in the first years of the Reformation; it can be found in Geiler of Kaiserberg and in Luther. In the Reformer's influential tract, *To the German Nobility*, usury and "Fuggerei" are denounced as the greatest misfortunes of Germany. Ulrich von Hutten said that of the four classes of robbers, free-booting knights, lawyers, priests and merchants, the merchants were the worst.

The imperial Diets reflected popular opinion faithfully enough to try their best to bridle the great companies. The Diet of Trèves-Cologne asked that monopolies and artificial enhancement of the prices of spice, copper and woollen cloth be prohibited. To effect this acts were passed intended to insure competition. This law against monopolies, however, was not vigorously enforced until the Imperial Treasurer cited before his tribunal many merchants of Augsburg accused of violating it. The panic-stricken offenders feverishly hastened to make interest with the princes and city magistrates. But their main support was the emperor, who intervened energetically in their favor. From this time the bankers and great merchants labored hard at each Diet to place the

control of monopolies in the hands of the monarch. In return for his constant support he was made a large sharer in the profits of the great houses.

In the struggle with the Diets, at last the capitalists were thoroughly successful. The Imperial Council of Regency passed an epoch-making ordinance, kept secret for fear of the people, expressly allowing merchants to sell at the highest prices they could get and recognizing certain monopolies said to be in the national interest as against other countries, and justified for the wages they provided for labor. About this time, for some reason, the agitation gradually died down. It is probable that the religious controversy took the public's mind off economic questions and the Peasant's War, like all unsuccessful but dangerous risings of the poor, was followed by a strong reaction in favor of the conservative rich. Moreover, it is evident that the currents of the time were too strong to be resisted by the feeble methods proposed by the reformers. When we remember that the chief practical measure recommended by Luther was the total prohibition of trading in spices and other foreign wares that took money out of the country, it is easy to see that the regulation of a complex industry was beyond the scope of his ability. And little, if any, enlightenment came from other quarters.

While the towns of southern Germany were becoming the world's banking and industrial centers, the cities of the Netherlands became its chief staple ports. For generations Antwerp had had two fairs a year, but in 1484 it started a perpetual market, open to all merchants, even to foreigners, the whole year round, and in addition to this it increased its fairs to four. Later a new Merchants' Exchange or Bourse was built in which almost all the transactions now seen on our stock or produce exchanges took place. There was wild speculation, partly on borrowed money, especially in pepper, the price of which furnished a sort of barometer of bourse feeling. Bets on prices and on events were made, and from this practice various forms of insurance took their rise.

The discovery of the new world brought an era of prosperity to Antwerp that doubtless put her at the head of all

commercial cities until the Spanish sword cut her down. In 1560 there were commonly 2500 ships anchored in her harbor, as against 500 at Amsterdam, her chief rival and eventual heir. Of these not uncommonly as many as 500 sailed in one day, and, it is said, 12,000 carriages came in daily, 2000 with passengers and 10,000 with wares. Even if these statements are considerable exaggerations, a reliable account of the exports in the single year 1560 shows the real greatness of the town. The total imports in that year amounted to 31,870,000 gulden (\$17,848,000), divided as follows: Italian silks, satins and ornaments 6,000,000 gulden; German dimities 1,200,000; German wines 3,000,000; Northern wheat 3,360,000; French wine 2,000,000; French dyes 600,000; French salt 360,000; Spanish wool 1,250,000; Spanish wine 1,600,000; Portuguese spices 2,000,000; English wool 500,000; English cloth 10,000,000. The last named article indicates the decay of Flemish weaving due to English competition. For a time there had been war to the knife with English merchants, following the great commercial treaty popularly called the *Malus Intercursus*. According to the theory then held that one nation's loss was another's gain, this treaty was considered a masterpiece of policy in England and the foundation of her commercial greatness. It and its predecessor, the *Magnus Intercursus*, marked the new policy, characteristic of modern times, that made commercial advantages a chief object of diplomacy and of legislation. Protective tariffs were enacted, the export of gold and silver prohibited, and sumptuary laws passed to encourage domestic industries. The policy as to export varied throughout the century and according to the article. The value of ships was highly appreciated. Sir Walter Raleigh opined that command of the sea meant command of the world's riches and ultimately of the world itself. Sir Humphrey Gilbert drew up a report advocating the acquisition of colonies as means of providing markets for home products. So little were the rights of the natives considered that Sir Humphrey stated that the savages would be amply rewarded for all that could be taken from them by the inestimable gift of Christianity.

As little regard was shown for the property of Catholics



as for that of heathens. Merry England drew her dividends from slave-trading and from buccaneering as well as from honest exchange of goods. There is something fascinating about the career of a man like Sir John Hawkins whose character was as infamous as his daring was serviceable. He early learned that "negroes were very good merchandise in Hispaniola and that they might easily be had upon the coast of Guinea," and so, financed by the British aristocracy and blessed by Protestant patriots, he chartered the *Jesus of Lübeck* and went burning, stealing and body-snatching in West African villages, crowded his hold full of blacks and sold those of them who survived at \$800 a head in the Indies. Quite fittingly he received as a crest "a demi-Moor, proper, in chains." He then went preying on the Spanish galleons, and at one time swindled Philip out of \$200,000 by pretending to be a traitor and a renegade; thus he rose from slaver to pirate and from pirate to admiral.

So pious, patriotic and profitable a business as buccaneering absorbed a greater portion of England's energies than did ordinary maritime commerce. A list of all ships engaged in foreign trade in 1572 shows that they amounted to an aggregate of only 51,000 tons burden, less than that of a single steamer of the largest size today. The largest ship that could reach London was of 240 tons, but some twice as large anchored at other harbors. Throughout the century trade multiplied, that of London, which profited the most, tenfold. If the customs' dues furnish an accurate barometer for the volume of trade, while London was increasing the other ports were falling behind not only relatively but positively. In the years 1506-9 London yielded to the treasury \$60,000 and other ports \$75,000; in 1581-2 London paid \$175,000 and other ports only \$25,000.

As she grew in size and wealth London, like Antwerp, felt the need of permanent fairs. From the continental city Sir Thomas Gresham, the English financial agent in the Netherlands, brought architect and materials and erected the Royal Exchange on the north side of Cornhill in London, where the same institution stands today. Built by Gresham



at his own expense, it was lined by a hundred small shops rented by him. As the new was rung in, the old passed away. The ancient restrictions on the fluidity of capital were almost broken down by the end of Elizabeth's reign. The statutes of bankruptcy, giving new and strong securities to creditors, marked the advent to power of the commercial class. Capitalism took form in the chartering of large companies. The first of these, "the mistery and company of the Merchant Adventurers for the discovery of regions, dominions, islands and places unknown," commonly called the Russia Company, was a joint-stock corporation with 240 members, each with a share valued at \$125. It traded principally with Russia, but, before the century was out, was followed by the Levant Company, the East India Company, and others, for the exploitation of other regions.

To northern Spain England sent coarse cloth, cottons, sheepskins, wheat, butter and cheese, and brought back wine, oranges, lemons and timber. To France went wax, tallow, butter, cheese, wheat, rye, "Manchester cloth," beans and biscuit in exchange for pitch, rosin, feathers, prunes and "great ynnions that be xii or xiiii ynches aboute," iron and wine. To the Russian Baltic ports, Riga, Reval and Narva went coarse cloth, "corrupt" (*i.e.*, adulterated) wine, conyskins, salt and brandy, and from the same came flax, hemp, pitch, tar, tallow, wax and furs. Salmon from Ireland and other fish from Scotland and Denmark were paid for by "corrupt" wines. To the Italian ports of Leghorn, Barcelona, Civita Vecchia and Venice, and to the Balearic Isles went lead, fine cloth, hides, Newfoundland fish and lime, and from them came oil, silk and fine porcelain. To Barbary went fine cloth, ordnance and artillery, armor and timber for oars, though, as a memorandum of 1580 says, "if the Spaniards catch you trading with them, you shall die for it." Probably what they objected to most was the sale of arms to the infidel. From Barbary came sugar, saltpetre, dates, molasses and carpets. Andalusia demanded fine cloth and cambric in return for wines called "seckes," sweet oil, raisins, salt, cochineal, indigo, sumac, silk and soap. Portugal took

butter, cheese, fine cloth "light green or sad blue," lead, tin and hides in exchange for salt, oil, soap, cinnamon, cloves, nutmegs, pepper and all other Indian wares.

While the English drove practically no trade with the East Indies, to the West Indies they sent directly oil, looking-glasses, knives, shears, scissors, linen, and wine which, to be salable, must be "singular good." From thence came gold, pearls "very orient and big withall," sugar and molasses. To Syria went colored cloth of the finest quality, and for it currants and sweet oil were taken. The establishment of an English factor in Turkey with the express purpose of furthering trade with that country is an interesting landmark in commercial history.

Even as late as the reign of Elizabeth England imported almost all "artificiality," as high-grade manufactures of a certain sort were called. A famous Elizabethan play turns on the scarcity of needles, the whole household being turned upside down to look for the one lost by Gammer Gurton. These articles, as well as knives, nails, pins, buttons, dolls, tennis-balls, tape, thread, glass, and laces, were imported from the Netherlands and Germany. From the same quarter came "small wares for grocers,"—by which may be meant cabbages, turnips and lettuce,—and also hops, copper and brass ware.

Having swept all before it in the domains of banking, mining and trade, capitalism, flushed with victory, sought for new worlds to conquer and found them in manufacture. Here also a great struggle was necessary. Hitherto the opposition to the new companies had been mainly on the part of the consumer; now the hostility of the laborer was aroused. The grapple of the two classes, in which the wage-earner went down, partly before the arquebus of the mercenary, partly under the lash and branding-iron of pitiless laws, will be described in the next section. Here it is not the strife of the classes, but of the two economic systems, that is considered. Capitalism won economically before it imposed its yoke on the vanquished by the harsh means of soldier and police. It won, in the final analysis, not because of the in-

herent power of concentrated wealth, though it used and abused this recklessly, but because, in the struggle for existence, it proved itself the form of life better fitted to survive in the conditions of modern society. It called forth technical improvements, it stimulated individual effort, it put an immense premium on thrift and investment, it cheapened production by the application of initially expensive but ultimately repaying, apparatus, it effected enormous economies in wholesale production and distribution. Before the new methods of business the old gilds stood as helpless, as unready, as bowmen in the face of cannon.

Each medieval "craft" or "mystery"<sup>1</sup> was in the hands of a gild, all the members of which were theoretically equal. Each passed through the ranks of apprentice and other lower grades until he normally became a master-workman and as such entitled to a full and equal share in the management. The gild managed its property almost like that of an endowment in the hands of trustees; it supervised the whole life of each member, took care of him when sick, buried him when dead and pensioned his widow. In these respects it was like some mutual benefit societies of our day. Almost inevitably in that age, it was under the protection of a patron saint and discharged various religious duties. It acted as a corporate whole in the government of the city and marched and acted as one on festive occasions.

As typical of the organization of industry at the turning-point may be given the list of gilds at Antwerp drawn up by Albert Dürer: There were goldsmiths, painters, stonecutters, embroiderers, sculptors, joiners, carpenters, sailors, fishermen, butchers, cloth-weavers, bakers, cobblers, "and all sorts of artisans and many laborers and merchants of provisions." The list is fully as significant for what it omits as for what it includes. Be it noted that there was no gild of printers, for that art had grown up since the crafts had begun to decline, and, though in some places found as a gild, was usually a combination of a learned profession and a capitalistic venture. Again, in this great banking and trading port, there is no mention of gilds of wholesale merchants

<sup>1</sup> From the Latin *ministerium*, French *métier*, not connected with "mystery."

(for the "merchants of provisions" were certainly not this) nor of bankers. These were two fully capitalized businesses. Finally, observe that there were many skilled and unskilled laborers not included in a special gild. Here we have the beginning of the proletariat. A century earlier there would have been no special class of laborers, a century later no gilds worth mentioning.

The gilds were handicapped by their own petty regulations. Notwithstanding the fact that their high standards of craftsmanship produced an excellent grade of goods, they were over-regulated and hide-bound, averse to new methods. There was as great a contrast between their meticulous traditions and the freer paths of the new capitalism as there was between scholasticism and science. They could neither raise nor administer the funds needed for foreign commerce and for export industries. Presently new technical methods were adopted by the capitalists, a finer way of smelting ores, and a new way of making brass, invented by Peter von Hoffberg, that saved 50 per cent. of the fuel previously used. In the textile industries came first the spinning-wheel, then the stocking-frame. So in other manufactures, new machinery required novel organization. Significant was the growth of new towns. The old cities were often so gild-ridden that they decayed, while places like Manchester sprang up suddenly at the call of employment. The constant effort of the gild had been to suppress competition and to organize a completely stationary society. In a dynamic world that which refuses to change, perishes. So the gilds, while charging all their woes to the government, really choked themselves to death in their own bands.

There is perhaps some analogy between the progress of capitalism in the sixteenth century and the process by which the trusts have come to dominate production in our own memory. The larger industries, and especially those connected with export trade, were seized and reorganized first; for a long time, indeed throughout the century, the gilds kept their hold on small, local industries. For a long time both systems went on side by side; the encroachment was



steady, but gradual. The exact method of the change was twofold. In the first place the constitution of the gild became more oligarchical. The older members tended to restrict the administration more and more; they increased the number of apprentices by lengthening the years of apprenticeship and reduced the poorer members to the rank of journeymen who were expected to work, not as before for a limited term of years, but for life, as wage-earners. When the journeymen rebelled, they were put down. The English Clothworkers' Court Book, for example, enacted the rule in 1538 that journeymen who would not work on conditions imposed by the masters should be imprisoned for the first offence and whipped and branded for the second. Nevertheless, to some extent, the master's calling was kept open to the more enterprising and intelligent laborers. It is this opportunity to rise that has always broken up the solidarity of the working class more than anything else.

But a second transforming influence worked faster from without than did the internal decay of the gild. This was the extension of the commercial system to manufacture. The gilds soon found themselves at the mercy of the great new companies that wanted wares in large quantities for export. Thus the commercial company came either to absorb or to dominate the industries that supplied it. An example of this is supplied by the Paris mercers, who, from being mainly dealers in foreign goods, gradually became employers of the crafts. Similarly the London haberdashers absorbed the crafts of the hatters and cappers. The middle man, who commanded the market, soon found the strategic value of his position for controlling the supply of articles. Commercial capital rapidly became industrial. One by one the great gilds fell under the control of commercial companies. One of the last instances was the formation of the Stationers' Company by which the printers were reduced to the rank of an industry subordinate to that of booksellers.

Finally came the legislative attack on the gilds, that broke what little power they had left. There is now a tendency to minimise the result of legislation in this field, but the impres-



sion that one gets by perusing the statutes not only of England but of Continental countries is that, while perhaps the governments would not have admitted any hostility to the guilds as such, they were strongly opposed to many features of them, and were determined to change them in accordance with the interests of the now dominant class. The policy of the moneyed men was not to destroy the crafts, but to exploit them; indeed they often found their old franchises extremely useful in arrogating to themselves the powers that had once belonged to the guild as a whole. The town governments were elected by the wealthy burghers; Parliaments soon came to side with them, and the monarch had already been bribed into an ally.

To give specific examples of the new trend is easy. When the great tapestry manufacture of Brussels was reorganized on a basis very favorable to the capitalists, the law sanctioning this step spoke contemptuously of the mutual benefit and religious functions of the guild as "petty details." Brandenburg now regulated the terms on which entrance to a guild should be allowed instead of leaving the matter as of old to the members themselves. The Polish nobility, jealous of the cities' monopoly of trade, demanded the total abolition of the guilds. A series of measures in England weakened the power of the guilds; under Edward VI their endowments for religious purposes were attacked, and this hurt them far more than would appear on the surface. The important Act Touching Weavers both witnessed the unhappy condition of the mysteries and, without seeming to do so, still further put them in the power of their masters. The workmen, it seems, had complained "that the rich and wealthy clothiers oppress them" by building up factories, or workshops in which many looms were installed, instead of keeping to the old commission or sweat-shop system, by which piece work was given out and done by each man at home. The guild-workmen preferred this method, because their great rival was the newly developed proletariat, masses of men who could only be accommodated in large buildings. The act, under the guise of redressing the grievance, in reality confirmed the powers of

the capitalists, for, while forbidding the use of factories outside of cities, it allowed them within towns and in the four northern counties, thus fortifying the monopolists in those places where they were strong, and hitting their rivals elsewhere. Further legislation, like the Elizabethan Statute of Apprentices, strengthened the hands of the masters at the expense of the journeymen. Such examples are only typical; similar laws were enacted throughout Europe. By act after act the employers were favored at the expense of the laborers.

There remained agriculture, at that time by far the largest and most important of all the means by which man wrings his sustenance from nature. Even now the greater part of the population in most civilized countries—and still more in semi-civilized—is rural, but four hundred years ago the proportion was much larger. England was a predominantly agricultural country until the eighteenth century,—England, the most commercial and industrial of nations! Though the last field to be attacked by capital, agriculture was as thoroughly renovated in the sixteenth century by this irrigating force as the other manners of livelihood had been transformed before it.

Medieval agriculture was carried on by peasants holding small amounts of land which would correspond to the small shops and slender capital of the handi-craftsman. Each local unit, whether free village or a manor, was made up of different kinds of land,—arable, commons for pasturing sheep and cattle, forests for gathering fire-wood and for herding swine and meadows for growing hay. The arable land was divided into three so-called “fields,” or sections, each field partitioned into smaller portions called in England “shots,” and these in turn were subdivided into acre strips. Each peasant possessed a certain number of these tiny lots, generally about thirty, ten in each field. Normally, one field would be left fallow each year in turn, one field would be sown with winter wheat or rye (the bread crop), and one field with barley for beer and oats for feeding the horses and cattle. Into this system it was impossible to introduce individualism. Each man had to plow and sow when the

village decided it should be done. And the commons and woodlands were free for all, with certain regulations.<sup>2</sup>

The art of farming was not quite primitive, but it had changed less since the dawn of history than it has changed since 1600. Instead of great steam-plows and all sorts of machinery for harrowing and harvesting, small plows were pulled by oxen, and hoes and rakes were plied by hand. Lime, marl and manure were used for fertilizing, but scantily. The cattle were small and thin, and after a hard winter were sometimes so weak that they had to be dragged out to pasture. Sheep were more profitable, and in the summer season good returns were secured from chickens, geese, swine and bees. Diseases of cattle were rife and deadly. The principles of breeding were hardly understood. Fitzherbert, who wrote on husbandry in the early sixteenth century, along with some sensible advice makes remarks, on the influence of the moon on horse-breeding, worthy of Hesiod. Indeed, the matter was left almost to itself until a statute of Henry VIII provided that no stallions above two years old and under fifteen hands high be allowed to run loose on the commons, and no mares of less than thirteen hands, lest the breed of horses deteriorate. It was to meet the same situation that the habit of castrating horses arose and became common about 1580.

The capitalistic attack on communistic agriculture took two principal forms. In some countries, like Germany, it was the consequence of the change from natural economy to money economy. The new commercial men bought up the estates of the nobles and subjected them to a more intense cultivation, at the same time using all the resources of law and government to make them as lucrative as possible.

But in two countries, England and Spain, and to some small extent in others, a profitable opportunity for investment was found in sheep-farming on a large scale. In England this manifested itself in "inclosures," by which was primarily meant the fencing in for private use of the commons, but secondarily came to be applied to the conversion

<sup>2</sup> For the substance of this paragraph, as well as for numerous suggestions on the rest of the chapter, I am indebted to Professor N. S. B. Gras, of Minneapolis.

of arable land into pasture<sup>3</sup> and the substitution of large holdings for small. The cause of the movement was the demand for wool in cloth-weaving, largely for export trade.

Contemporaries noticed with much alarm the operations of this economic change. A cry went up that sheep were eating men, that England was being turned into one great pasture to satisfy the greed of the rich, while the land needed for grain was abandoned and tenants forcibly ejected. The outcry became loudest about the years 1516-8, when a commission was appointed to investigate the "evil" of inclosures. It was found that in the past thirty years the amount of land in the eight counties most affected was 22,500 acres. This was not all for grazing; in Yorkshire it was largely for sport, in the Midlands for plowing, in the south for pasture.

The acreage would seem extremely small to account for the complaint it excited. Doubtless it was only the chief and most typical of the hardships caused to a certain class by the introduction of new methods. One is reminded of the bitter hostility to the introduction of machinery in the nineteenth century, when the vast gain in wealth to the community as a whole, being indirect, seemed cruelly purchased at the cost of the sufferings of these laborers who could not adapt themselves to the novel methods. Evolution is always hard on a certain class and the sufferers quite naturally vociferate their woes without regard to the real causes of the change or to the larger interests of society.

Certain it is that inclosures went on uninterrupted throughout the century, in spite of legislative attempts to stop them. Indeed, they could hardly help continuing, when they were so immensely profitable. Land that was inclosed for pasture brought five pounds for every three pounds it had paid under the plow. Sheep multiplied accordingly. The law of 1534 spoke of some men owning as many as 24,000 sheep, and unwittingly gave, in the form of a complaint, the cause thereof, namely that the price of wool had recently doubled. The law limited the number of sheep allowed to one man to 2000. The people arose and slaughtered sheep wholesale in one of those unwise and blind, but not unnatural, out-

<sup>3</sup> Although some of the inclosed land was tilled; see below.

bursts of sabotage by which the proletariat now and then seeks to destroy the wealth that accentuates their poverty. Then as always, the only causes for unwelcome alterations of their manner of life seen by them was the greed and heartlessness of a ring of men, or of the government. The deeper economic forces escaped detection, or at least, attention.

During the period 1450-1610 it is probable that about  $2\frac{3}{4}$  per cent. of the total area of England had been inclosed. The counties most affected were the Midlands, in some of which the amount of land affected was 8 per cent. to 9 per cent. of the total area. But though the aggregate seems small, it was a much larger proportion, in the then thinly settled state of the realm, of the total arable land,—of this it was probably one-fifth. Under Elizabeth perhaps one-third of the improved land was used for grazing and two-thirds was under the plow.

In Spain the same tendency to grow wool for commercial purposes manifested itself in a slightly different form. There, not by the inclosure of commons, but by the establishment of a monopoly by the Castilian "sheep-trust," the Mesta, did a large corporation come to prevail over the scattered and peasant agricultural interests. The Mesta, which existed from 1273 to 1836, reached the pinnacle of its power in the first two-thirds of the sixteenth century. When it took over from the government the appointment of the officer supposed to supervise it in the public interest, the Alcalde Entregador, it may be said to have won a decisive victory for capitalism. At that time it owned as many as seven million sheep, and exported wool to the weight of 55,000 tons and to the value of \$560,000, per annum.

Having mastered the sources of wealth offered by wool-growing, the capitalists next turned to arable land and by their transformation of it took the last step in the commercializing of life. Even now, in England, land is not regarded as quite the same kind of investment as a factory or railroad; there is still the vestige of a tradition that the tenant has customary privileges against the right of the owner of the



land to exploit it for all it is worth. But this is indeed a faint ghost of the medieval idea that the custom was sacred and the profit of the landlord entirely secondary. The longest step away from the medieval to the modern system was taken in the sixteenth century, and its outward and visible sign was the substitution of the leasehold for the ancient copyhold. The latter partook of the nature of a vested right or interest; the former was but a contract for a limited, often for a short, term, at the end of which the tenant could be ejected, the rent raised, or, as was most usual, an enormous fine (*i.e.*, fee) exacted for renewal of the lease.

The revolution was facilitated by, if it did not in part consist of, the acquisition of the land by the new commercial class, resulting in increased productivity. New and better methods of tillage were introduced. The scattered thirty acres of the peasant were consolidated into three ten-acre fields, henceforth to be used as the owner thought best. One year a field would be under a cereal crop; the next year converted into pasture. This improved method, known as "convertible husbandry" practiced in England and to a lesser extent on the Continent, was a big step in the direction of scientific agriculture. Regular rotation of crops was hardly a common practice before the eighteenth century, but there was something like it in places where hemp and flax would be alternated with cereals. Capitalists in the Netherlands built dykes, drained marshes and dug expensive canals. Elsewhere also swamps were drained and irrigation begun. But perhaps no single improvement in technique accounted for the greater yield of the land so much as the careful and watchful self-interest of the private owner, as against the previous semi-communistic carelessness. Several popular proverbs then gained currency in the sense that there is no fertilizer of the glebe like that put on by the master himself. Harrison's statement, in Elizabeth's reign, that an inclosed acre yielded as much as an acre and a half of common, is borne out by the English statistics of the grain trade. From 1500 to 1534, while the process of inclosure was at its height, the export of corn more than doubled; it then diminished until it almost ceased in 1563, after which it rapidly

increased until 1600. During the whole century the population was growing, and it is therefore reasonable to suppose that the yield of the soil was considerably greater in 1600 than it was in 1500.

It must, however, be admitted that the increase in exports was in part caused by and in part symptomatic of a change in the policy of the government. When commerce became king he looked out for his own interests first, and identified these interests with the dividends of small groups of his chief ministers. Trade was regulated, by tariff and bounty, no longer in the interests of the consumer but in those of the manufacturer and merchant. The corn-laws of nineteenth-century England have their counterpart in the Elizabethan policy of encouraging the export of grain that was needed at home. As soon as the land and the Parliament both fell into the hands of the new capitalistic landlords, they used the one to enhance the profits of the other. Nor was England alone in this. France favored the towns, that is the industrial centers, by forcing the rural population to sell at very low rates, and by encouraging export of grain. Perhaps this same policy was most glaring of all in Sixtine Rome, where the Papal States were taxed, as the provinces of the Empire had been before, to keep bread cheap in the city.

## § 2. The Rise of the Money Power

In modern times, Money has been king. Perhaps at a certain period in the ancient world wealth had as much power as it has now, but in the Middle Ages it was not so. Money was then ignored by the tenant or serf who paid his dues in feudal service or in kind; it was despised by the noble as the vulgar possession of Jews or of men without gentle breeding, and it was hated by the church as filthy lucre, the root of all evil and, together with sex, as one of the chief instruments of Satan. The "religious" man would vow poverty as well as celibacy.

But money now became too powerful to be neglected or despised, and too desirable to be hated. In the age of transition the medieval and modern conceptions of riches are found side by side. When Holbein came to London the

Hanse merchants there employed him to design a pageant for the coronation of Anne Boleyn. In their hall he painted two allegorical pictures, *The Triumph of Poverty* and *The Triumph of Wealth*. The choice of subjects was representative of the time of transition.

The economic innovation sketched in the last few pages was followed by a social readjustment sufficiently violent and sufficiently rapid to merit the name of revolution. The wave struck different countries at different times, but when it did come in each, it came with a rush, chiefly in the twenties in Germany and Spain, in the thirties and forties in England, a little later, with the civil wars, in France. It submerged all classes but the bourgeoisie; or, rather, it subjugated them all and forced them to follow, as in a Roman triumph, the conquering car of Wealth.

The one other power in the state that was visibly aggrandized at the expense of other classes, besides the plutocracy, was that of the prince. This is sometimes spoken of as the result of a new political theory, an iniquitous, albeit unconscious, conspiracy of Luther and Machiavelli, to exalt the divine right of kings. But in truth their theories were but an expression of the accomplished, or easily foreseen, fact; and this fact was due in largest measure to the need of the commercial class for stable and for strong government. Riches, which at the dawn of the twentieth century seemed, momentarily, to have assumed a cosmopolitan character, were then bound up closely with the power of the state. To keep order, to bridle the lawless, to secure concessions and markets, a mercantile society needed a strong executive, and this they could find only in the person of the prince. Luther says that kings are only God's gaolers and hangmen, high-born and splendid because the meanest of God's servants must be thus accoutred. It would be a little truer to say that they were the gaolers and hangmen hired by the bourgeoisie to over-awe the masses and that their quaint trappings and titles were kept as an ornament to the gay world of snobbery.

Together with the monarchy, the new masters of men developed other instruments, parliamentary government in some countries, a bureaucracy in others, and a mercenary

army in nearly all. At that time was either invented or much quoted the saying that gold was one of the nerves of war. The expensive firearms that blew up the feudal castle were equally deadly when turned against the rioting peasants.

Just as the burgher was ready to shoulder his way into the front rank, he was greatly aided by the frantic civil strife that broke out in both the older privileged orders. Never was better use made of the maxim, "divide and conquer," than when the Reformation divided the church, and the civil wars, dynastic in England, feudal in Germany and nominally religious in France, broke the sword of the noble. When the earls and knights had finished cutting each others' throats there were hardly enough of them left to make a strong stand. Occasionally they tried to do so, as in the revolt of Sickingen in Germany, of the Northern Earls in England, and in the early stages of the rising of the Comuneros in Spain. In every case they were defeated, and the work of the sword was completed by the axe and the dagger. Whether they trod the blood-soaked path to the Tower, or whether they succumbed to the hired assassins of Catharine, the old nobles were disposed of and the power of their caste was broken. But their places were soon taken by new men. Some bought baronies and titles outright, others ripened more gradually to these honors in the warmth of the royal smile and on the sunny slopes of manors wrested from the monks. But the end finally attained was that the coronet became a mere bauble in the hands of the rich, the final badge of social deference to success in money-making.

Still more violent was the spoliation of the church. The confiscations carried out in the name of religion redounded to the benefit of the newly rich. It is true that all the property taken did not fall into their hands; some was kept by the prince, more was used to found or endow hospices, schools and asylums for the poor. But the most and the best of the land was soon thrown to the eager grasp of traders and merchants. In England probably one-sixth of all the cultivated soil in the kingdom was thus transferred, in the course of a few years, into the hands of new men. Thus were created many of the "county families" of England, and thus



the new interest soon came to dominate Parliament. Under Henry VII the House of Lords, at one important session, mustered thirty spiritual and only eighteen temporal peers. In the reign of his son the temporal peers came to outnumber the spiritual, from whom the abbots had been subtracted. The Commons became, what they remained until the nineteenth century, a plutocracy representing either landed or commercial wealth.

Somewhat similar secularizations of ecclesiastical property took place throughout Germany, the cities generally leading. The process was slow, but certain, in Electoral Saxony, Hesse and the other Protestant territories, and about the same time in Sweden and in Denmark. But something of the same methods were recommended even in Roman Catholic lands and in Russia of the Eastern Church, so contagious were the examples of the Reformers. Venice forbade gifts or legacies to church or cloisters. France, where confiscation was proposed, partially attained the same ends by subjecting the clergy to the power of the crown.

Among the groups into which society naturally falls is that of the intellectual class, the body of professional men, scientists, writers and teachers. This group, just as it came into a new prominence in the sixteenth century, at the same time became in part an annex and a servant to the money power. The high expense of education as compared with the Middle Ages, the enormous fees then charged for graduating in professional schools, the custom of buying livings in the church and practices in law and medicine, the need of patronage in letters and art, made it nearly impossible for the sons of the poor to enter into the palace of learning. Moreover the patronage of the wealthy, their assertion of a monopoly of good form and social prestige, seduced the professional class that now ate from the merchant's hand, aped his manners, and served his interests. For four hundred years law, divinity, journalism, art, and education, have cut their coats, at least to some extent, in the fashion of the court of wealth.

Last of all, there remained the only power that proved itself nearly a match for money, that of labor. Far outnumbered



bering the capitalists, in every other way the workers were their inferiors,—in education, in organization, in leadership and in material resources. One thing that made their struggle so hard was that those men of exceptional ability who might have been their leaders almost always made fortunes of their own and then turned their strength against their former comrades. Labor also suffered terribly from quacks and ranters with counsels of folly or of madness.

The social wars of the sixteenth century partook of the characteristics of both medieval and modern times. The Peasants' Revolt in Germany was both communistic and religious; the risings of Comuneros and the Hermandad in Spain were partly communistic; the several rebellions in England were partly religious. But a new element marked them all, the demand on the part of the workers for better wages and living conditions. The proletariat of town and mining district joined the German peasants in 1524; the revolt was in many respects like a gigantic general strike.

Great as are the ultimate advantages of freedom, the emancipation of the serfs cannot be reckoned as an immediate economic gain to them. They were freed not because of the growth of any moral sentiment, much less as the consequence of any social cataclysm, but because free labor was found more profitable than unfree. It is notable that serfs were emancipated first in those countries like Scotland where there had been no peasants' revolt; the inference is that they were held in bondage in other countries longer than it was profitable to do so for political reasons. The last serf was reclaimed in Scotland in 1365, but the serfs had not been entirely freed in England even in the reign of Elizabeth. In France the process went on rapidly in the 15th century, often against the wishes of the serfs themselves. One hundred thousand peasants emigrated from Northern France to Burgundy at that time to exchange their free for a servile state. However, they did not enjoy their bondage for long. Serfs in the Burgundian state, especially in the Netherlands, lost their last chains in the sixteenth century, most rapidly between the years 1515 and 1531. In Germany serfdom remained far beyond the end of the sixteenth cen-

ture, doubtless in part because of the fears excited by the civil war of 1525.

In place of the old serfdom under one master came a new and detailed regulation of labor by the government. This regulation was entirely from the point of view, and consequently all but entirely in the interests, of the propertied classes. The form was the old form of medieval paternalism, but the spirit was the new spirit of capitalistic gain. The endeavor of the government to be fair to the laborer as well as to the employer is very faint, but it is just perceptible in some laws.

Most of the taxes and burdens of the state were loaded on the backs of the poor. Hours of labor were fixed at from 12 to 15 according to the season. Regulation of wages was not sporadic, but was a regular part of the work of certain magistrates, in England of the justices of the peace. Parliament enforced with incredible severity the duty of the poor and able-bodied man to work. Sturdy idlers were arrested and drafted into the new proletariat needed by capital. When whipping, branding, and short terms of imprisonment, did not suffice to compel men to work, a law was passed to brand able-bodied vagrants on the chest with a "V," and to assign them to some honest neighbor "to have and to hold as a slave for the space of two years then next following." The master should "only give him bread and water and small drink and such refuse of meat as he should think meet to cause the said slave to work." If the slave still idled, or if he ran away and was caught again he was to be marked on the face with an "S" and to be adjudged a slave for life. If finally refractory he was to be sentenced as a felon. This terrible measure, intended partly to reduce lawless vagrancy, partly to supply cheap labor to employers, failed of its purpose and was repealed in two years. Its re-enactment was vainly urged by Cecil upon Parliament in 1559. As a substitute for it in this year the law was passed forbidding masters to receive any workman without a testimonial from his last employer; laborers were not allowed to stop work or change employers without good cause, and conversely employers were forbidden to dismiss servants "unduly."

In Germany the features of the modern struggle between owners and workers are plainest. In mining, especially, there developed a real proletariat, a class of laborers seeking employment wherever it was best paid and combining and striking for higher wages. To combat them were formed pools of employers to keep down wages and to blacklist agitators. Typical of these was the agreement made by Duke George of Saxony and other large mine-owners not to raise wages, not to allow miners to go from place to place seeking work, and not to hire any troublesome agitator once dismissed by any operator.

It is extraordinary how rapidly many features of the modern proletariat developed. Take, for example, the housing problem. As this became acute some employers built model tenements for their workers. Others started stores at which they could buy food and clothing, and even paid them in part in goods instead of in money. Labor tended to become fluid, moving from one town to another and from one industry to another according to demand. Such a thing had been not unknown in the previous centuries; it was strongly opposed by law in the sixteenth. The new risks run by workers were brought out when, for the first time in history, a great mining accident took place in 1515, a flood by which eighty-eight miners were drowned. Women began to be employed in factories and were cruelly exploited. Most sickening of all, children were forced, as they still are in some places, to wear out their little lives in grinding toil. The lace-making industry in Belgium, for example, fell entirely into the hands of children. Far from protesting against this outrage, the law actually sanctioned it by the provision that no girl over twelve be allowed to make lace, lest the supply of maidservants be diminished.

Strikes there were and rebellions of all sorts, every one of them beaten back by the forces of the government and of the capitalists combined. The kings of commerce were then, more than now, a timorous and violent race, for then they were conscious of being usurpers. When they saw a Münzer or a Kett—the mad Hamlets of the people—mop and mow and stage their deeds before the world, they

became frantic with terror and could do nought but take subtle counsel to kill these heirs, or pretenders, to their realms. The great rebellions are all that history now pays much attention to, but in reality the warfare on the poor was ceaseless, a chronic disease of the body politic. Louis XI spared nothing, disfranchisement, expulsion, wholesale execution, to beat down the lean and hungry conspirators against the public order, whose raucous cries of misery he detested. With somewhat gentler, because stronger, hand, his successors followed in his footsteps. But when needed the troops were there to support the rich. The great strike of printers at Lyons is one example of several in France. In the German mines there were occasional strikes, sternly suppressed by the princes acting in agreement.

There can be no doubt that the economic developments of the sixteenth century worked tremendous hardship to the poor. It was noted everywhere that whereas wine and meat were common articles in 1500, they had become luxuries by 1600. Some scholars have even argued from this a diminution of the wealth of Europe during the century. This, however, was not the case. The aggregate of capital, if we may judge from many other indications, notably increased throughout the century. But it became more and more concentrated in a few hands.

The chief natural cause of the depression of the working class was the rise in prices. Wages have always shown themselves more sluggish in movement than commodities. While money wages, therefore, remained nearly stationary, real wages shrank throughout the century. In 1600 a French laborer was obliged to spend 55 per cent. of his wages merely on food. A whole day's labor would only buy him two and one half pounds of salt. Rents were low, because the houses were incredibly bad. At that time a year's rent for a laborer's tenement cost from ten to twenty days labor; it now costs about thirty days' labor. The new commerce robbed the peasant of some of his markets by substituting foreign articles like indigo and cochineal for domestic farm products. The commercialization of agriculture worked manifold hardship to the peasant. Many were turned off their

farms to make way for herds of sheep, and others were hired on new and harder terms to pay in money for the land they had once held on customary and not too oppressive terms of service and dues.

Under all the splendors of the Renaissance, with its fields of cloth of gold and its battles like knightly jousts, with its constant stream of adulation from artists and authors, with the ostentation of the new wealth and the greedily tasted pleasures of living and enjoying, an attentive ear can hear the low, uninterrupted murmurs of the wretched, destined to burst forth, on the day of despair or of vengeance, into ferocious clamors. Nor was there then much pity for the poor. The charity and worship for "apostolic poverty" of the Middle Ages had ceased, nor had that social kindness, so characteristic of our own time that it is affected even by those who do not feel it, arisen. The rich and noble, absorbed in debauchery or art, regarded the peasant as a different race—"the ox without horns" they called him—to be cudgelled while he was tame and hunted like a wolf when he ran wild. Artists and men of letters ignored the very existence of the unlettered, with the superb Horatian, "I hate the vulgar crowd and I keep them off," or, if they were aroused for a moment by the noise of civil war merely remarked, with Erasmus, that any tyranny was better than that of the mob. Churchmen like Matthew Lang and Warham and the popes oppressed the poor whom Jesus loved. "Rustica gens optima flens" smartly observed a canon of Zurich, while Luther blurted out, "accursed, thievish, murderous peasants" and "the gentle" Melanchthon almost sighed, "the ass *will* have blows and the people *will* be ruled by force."

There were, indeed, a few honorable exceptions to the prevalent callousness. "I praise thee, thou noble peasant," wrote an obscure German, "before all creatures and lords upon earth; the emperor must be thy equal." The little read epigrams of Euricius Cordus, a German humanist who was, by exception, also humane, denounce the blood-sucking of the peasants by their lords. Greatest of all, Sir Thomas More felt, not so much pity for the lot of the poor, as indignation at their wrongs. *The Utopia* will always remain



one of the world's noblest books because it was almost the first to feel and to face the social problem.

This became urgent with the large increase of pauperism and vagrancy throughout the sixteenth century, the most distressing of the effects of the economic revolution. When life became too hard for the evicted tenant of a sheep-raising landlord, or for the *déclassé* journeyman of the town gild, he had little choice save to take to the road. Gangs of sturdy vagrants, led by and partly composed of old soldiers, wandered through Europe. But a little earlier than the sixteenth century that race of mendicants the Gipsies, made their *début*. The word "rogue" was coined in England about 1550 to name the new class. *The Book of Vagabonds*, written by Matthew Hütlin of Pfortzheim, describes twenty-eight varieties of beggars, exposes their tricks, and gives a vocabulary of their jargon. Some of these beggars are said to be dangerous, threatening the wayfarer or householder who will not pay them; others feign various diseases, or make artificial wounds and disfigurements to excite pity, or take a religious garb, or drag chains to show that they had escaped from galleys, or have other plausible tales of woe and of adventure. All contemporaries testify to the alarming numbers of these men and women; how many they really were it is hard to say. It has been estimated that in 1500 20 per cent. of the population of Hamburg and 15 per cent. of the population of Augsburg were paupers. Under Elizabeth probably from a quarter to a third of the population of London were paupers, and the country districts were just as bad. Certain parts of Wales were believed to have a third of their population in vagabondage.

In the face of this appalling situation the medieval method of charity completely broke down. In fact, with its many begging friars, with its injunction of alms-giving as a good work most pleasing to God, and with its respect for voluntary poverty, the church rather aggravated than palliated the evil of mendicancy. The state had to step in to relieve the church.

This was early done in the Netherlands. A severe edict was issued and repeatedly re-enacted against tramps ordering

them to be whipped, have their heads shaved, and to be further punished with stocks. An enterprising group of humanists and lawyers demanded that the government should take over the duty of poor-relief from the church. Accordingly at Lille a "common chest" was started, the first civil charitable bureau in the Netherlands. At Bruges a cloister was secularized and turned into a school for eight hundred poor children in uniform. A secular bureau of charity was started at Antwerp.

Under these circumstances the humanist Lewis Vives wrote his famous tract on the relief of the poor, in the form of a letter to the town council of Bruges. In this well thought out treatise he advocated the law that no one should eat who did not work, and urged that all able-bodied vagrants should be hired out to artisans—a suggestion how welcome to the capitalists eager to draft men into their workshops! Cases of people unable to work should also be taken up, and they should be cared for by application of religious endowments by the government. Vives' claim to recognition lies even more in his spirit than in his definite program. For almost the first time in history he plainly said that poverty was a disgrace as well as a danger to the state and should be, not palliated, but extirpated.

While Vives was still preparing his treatise the city of Ypres (tragic name!) had already sought his advice and acted upon it, as well as upon the example of earlier reforms in German cities, in promulgating an ordinance. The city government combined all religious and philanthropic endowments into one fund and appointed a committee to administer it, and to collect further gifts. These citizens were to visit the poor in their dwellings, to apply what relief was necessary, to meet twice a week to concert remedial measures and to have charge of enforcing the laws against begging and idleness. All children of the poor were sent to school or taught a trade.

Though there were sporadic examples of municipal poor-relief in Germany prior to the Reformation, it was the religious movement that there first gave the cause its decisive impulse. In his *Address to the German Nobility* Luther had

recommended that each city should take care of its own poor and suppress "the rascally trade of begging." During his absence at the Wartburg his more radical colleagues had taken steps to put these ideas into practice at Wittenberg. A common fund was started by the application of ecclesiastical endowments, from which orphans were to be housed, students at school and university to be helped, poor girls dowered and needy workmen loaned money at four per cent. A severe law against begging was passed. Augsburg and Nuremberg followed the example of Wittenberg almost at once and other German cities, to the number of forty-eight, one by one joined the procession.

For fairly obvious reasons the state regulation of pauperism, though it did not originate in the Reformation, was much more rapidly and thoroughly developed in Protestant lands. In these the power of the state and the economic revolution attained their maximum development, whereas the Roman church was inclined, or obligated, to stand by the medieval position. "Alms-giving is papistry," said a Scotch tract. Thus Christian Cellarius, a professor at Louvain, published *A Plea for the Right of the Poor to Beg*. The Spanish monk, Lawrence da Villavicenzio in his *Sacred Economy of caring for the Poor*, condemned the whole plan of state regulation and subvention as heretical. The Council of Trent, also, put itself on the medieval side, and demanded the restoration to the church of the direction of charity.

But even in Catholic lands the new system made headway. As the University of Paris approved the ordinance of Ypres, in France, and in Catholic Germany, a plan comprising elements of the old order, but informed by the modern spirit, grew up.

In England the problem of pauperism became more acute than elsewhere. The drastic measures taken to force men to work failed to supply all needs. After municipal relief of various sorts had been tried, and after the government had in vain tried to stimulate private munificence to co-operate with the church to meet the growing need, the first compulsory Poor Rates were laid. Three or four years later came an act for setting the poor to labor in workhouses. These

measures failed of the success that met the continental method. Even compared to Scotland, England developed a disproportionate amount of pauperism. Some authorities have asserted that by giving the poor a legal right to aid she encouraged the demand for it. Probably, however, she simply furnished the extreme example of the commercialism that made money but did not make men.

## Chapter 3

### Main Currents of Thought

WERE WE reading the biography of a wayward genius, we should find the significance of the book neither in the account of his quarrels and of his sins nor in the calculation of his financial difficulties and successes, but in the estimate of his contributions to the beauty and wisdom of the world. Something the same is true about the history of a race or of a period; the political and economic events are but the outward framework; the intellectual achievement is both the most attractive and the most repaying object of our study. In this respect the sixteenth century was one of the most brilliant; it produced works of science that outstripped all its predecessors; it poured forth masterpieces of art and literature that are all but matchless.

#### § 1. Biblical and Classical Scholarship

It is naturally impossible to give a full account of all the products of sixteenth century genius. In so vast a panorama only the mountain peaks can be pointed out. One of these peaks is assuredly the Bible. Never before nor since has that book been so popular; never has its study absorbed so large a part of the energies of men. It is true that the elucidation of the text was not proportional to the amount of labor spent on it. For the most part it was approached not in a scientific but in a dogmatic spirit. Men did not read it historically and critically but to find their own dogmas in it. Nevertheless, the foundations were laid for both the textual and the higher criticism.

The Greek text of the New Testament was first published by Erasmus in March, 1516. Revised, but not always improved, editions were brought out by him in 1519, 1522 and 1527. For the first edition he had before him ten manuscripts, all of them minuscules, the oldest of which, though



he believed it might have come from the apostolic age, is assigned by modern criticism to the twelfth century. In the course of printing, some bad errors were introduced, and the last six verses of the Apocalypse, wanting in all the manuscripts, were supplied by an extremely faulty translation from the Latin. The results were such as might have been anticipated. Though the text has been vastly purified by modern critics, the edition of Erasmus was of great service and was thoroughly honest. He noted that the last verses of Mark were doubtful and that the passage on the adulteress (John vii, 53 to viii, 11) was lacking in the best authorities, and he omitted the text on the three heavenly witnesses (I John v, 7) as wanting in all his manuscripts.

For this omission he was violently attacked. To support his position he asked his friend Bombasius to consult the Codex Vaticanus, and dared to assert that were a single manuscript found with the verse in Greek, he would include it in subsequent editions. Though there were at the time no codices with the verse in question—which was a Latin forgery of the fourth century, possibly due to Priscillian—one was promptly manufactured. Though Erasmus suspected the truth, that the verse had been interpolated from the Latin text, he added it in his third edition “that no occasion for calumny be given.” This one sample must serve to show how Erasmus’s work was received. For every deviation from the Vulgate, whether in the Greek text or in the new Latin translation with which he accompanied it, he was ferociously assailed. His own anecdote of the old priest who, having the misprint “mumpsimus” for “sumpsimus” in his missal, refused to correct the error when it was pointed out, is perfectly typical of the position of his critics. New truth must ever struggle hard against old prejudice.

While Erasmus was working, a much more ambitious scheme for publishing the Scriptures was maturing under the direction of Cardinal Ximénez at Alcalá or, as the town was called in Latin, Complutum. The Complutensian Polyglot, as it was thence named, was published in six volumes, four devoted to the Old Testament, one to the New Testament, and one to a Hebrew lexicon and grammar. The New

Testament volume has the earliest date, 1514, but was withheld from the public for several years after this. The manuscripts from which the Greek texts were taken are unknown, but they were better than those used by Erasmus. The later editors of the Greek text in the sixteenth century, Robert Estienne (Stephanus) and Theodore Beza, did little to castigate it, although one of the codices used by Beza, and now known by his name, is of great value.

The Hebrew Massoretic text of the Old Testament was printed by Gerson Ben Mosheh at Brescia in 1494, and far more elaborately in the first four volumes of the Complutensian Polyglot. With the Hebrew text the Spanish editors offered the Septuagint Greek, the Syriac, and the Vulgate, the Hebrew, Syriac and Greek having Latin translations. The manuscripts for the Hebrew were procured from Rome. A critical revision was undertaken by Sebastian Münster and published with a new Latin version at Basle 1534-5. Later recensions do not call for special notice here. An incomplete text of the Syriac New Testament was published at Antwerp in 1569.

The numerous new Latin translations made during this period testify to the general discontent with the Vulgate. Not only humanists like Valla, Lefèvre and Erasmus, but perfectly orthodox theologians like Pope Nicholas V, Cajetan and Sadoletus, saw that the common version could be much improved. In the new Latin translation by Erasmus many of the errors of the Vulgate were corrected. Thus, in Matthew iii, 2, he offers "resipiscite" or "ad mentem redite" instead of "poenitentiam agite." This, as well as his substitution of "sermo" for "verbum" in John i, 1, was fiercely assailed. Indeed, when it was seen what use was made by the Protestants of the new Greek texts and of the new Latin versions, of which there were many, a strong reaction followed in favor of the traditional text. Even by the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot the Vulgate was regarded with such favor that, being printed between the Hebrew and Greek, it was compared by them to Christ crucified between the two thieves. The Sorbonne condemned as "Lutheran" the assertion that the Bible could not be properly

understood or expounded without knowledge of the original languages. In the decree of Trent the Vulgate was declared to be the authentic form of the Scriptures. The preface to the English Catholic version printed at Rheims defends the thesis, now generally held by Catholics, that the Latin text is superior in accuracy to the Greek, having been corrected by Jerome, preserved by the church and sanctioned by the Council of Trent. In order to have this text in its utmost purity an official edition was issued.

Modern critics, having far surpassed the results achieved by their predecessors, are inclined to underestimate their debts to these pioneers in the field. The manuals, encyclopaedias, commentaries, concordances, special lexicons, all that make an introduction to biblical criticism so easy nowadays, were lacking then, or were supplied only by the labor of a life-time. The professors at Wittenberg, after prolonged inquiry, were unable to find a map of Palestine. The first Hebrew concordance was printed, with many errors, at Venice in 1523; the first Greek concordance not until 1546, at Basle. To find a parallel passage or illustrative material or ancient comment on a given text, the critic then had to search through dusty tomes and manuscripts, instead of finding them accumulated for him in ready reference books. That all this has been done is the work of ten generations of scholars, among whom the pioneers of the Renaissance should not lack their due meed of honor. The early critics were hampered by a vicious inherited method. The schoolmen, with purely dogmatic interest, had developed a hopeless and fantastic exegesis, by which every text of Scripture was given a fourfold sense, the historical, allegorical, tropological (or figurative) and anagogical (or didactic).

Erasmus, under the tuition of Valla, felt his way to a more fruitful method. It is true that his main object was a moral one, the overthrow of superstition and the establishment of the gentle "philosophy of Christ." He used the allegorical method only, or chiefly, to explain away as fables stories that would seem silly or obscene as history. In the New Testament he sought the man Jesus and not the deified Christ. He preferred the New Testament, with its "simple,

plain and gentle truth, without savor of superstition or cruelty" to the Old Testament. He discriminated nicely even among the books of the New Testament, considering the chief ones the gospels, Acts, the Pauline epistles (except Hebrews), I Peter and I John. He hinted that many did not consider the Apocalypse canonical; he found Ephesians Pauline in thought but not in style; he believed Hebrews to have been written by Clement of Rome; and he called James lacking in apostolic dignity.

By far the best biblical criticism of the century was the mature work of Martin Luther. It is a remarkable fact that a man whose doctrine of the binding authority of Scripture was so high, and who refused his disciples permission to interpret the text with the least shade of independence, should himself have shown a freedom in the treatment of the inspired writers unequaled in any Christian for the next three centuries. It is sometimes said that Luther's judgments were mere matters of taste; that he took what he liked and rejected what he disliked, and this is true to a certain extent. "What treats well of Christ, that is Scripture, even if Judas and Pilate had written it," he averred, and again, "If our adversaries urge the Bible against Christ, we must urge Christ against the Bible." His wish to exclude the epistle of James from the canon, on the ground that its doctrine of justification contradicted that of Paul, was thus determined, and excited wide protest not only from learned Catholics like Sir Thomas More, but also from many Protestants, beginning with Bullinger.

But Luther's trenchant judgments of the books of the Bible were usually far more than would be implied by a merely dogmatic interest. Together with the best scholarship of the age he had a strong intuitive feeling for style that guided him aright in many cases. In denying the Mosaic authorship of a part of the Pentateuch, in asserting that Job and Jonah were fables, in finding that the books of Kings were more credible than Chronicles and that the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Proverbs and Ecclesiastes had received their final form from later editors, he but advanced theses now universally accepted. His doubts about

Esther, Hebrews, and the Apocalypse have been amply confirmed. Some modern scholars agree with his most daring opinion, that the epistle of James was written by "some Jew who had heard of the Christians but not joined them." After Luther the voluminous works of the commentators are a dreary desert of arid dogmatism and fantastic pedantry. Carlstadt was perhaps the second best of the higher critics of the time; Zwingli was conservative; Calvin's exegesis slumbers in fifty volumes in deserved neglect.

Among the great vernacular Protestant versions of the Bible that of Luther stands first in every sense of the word. Long he had meditated on it before his enforced retirement at the Wartburg gave him the leisure to begin it. The work of revision, in which Luther had much help from Melancthon and other Wittenberg professors, was a life-long labor. Only recently have the minutes of the meetings of these scholars come to light, and they testify to the endless trouble taken by the Reformer to make his work clear and accurate. He wrote no dialect, but a common, standard German which he believed to have been introduced by the Saxon chancery. But he also modelled his style not only on the few good German authors then extant, but on the speech of the market-place. From the mouths of the people he took the sweet, common words that he gave back to them again, "so that they may note that we are speaking German to them." Spirit and fire he put into the German Bible; dramatic turns of phrase, lofty eloquence, poetry.

All too much Luther read his own ideas into the Bible. To make Moses "so German that no one would know that he was a Jew" insured a noble style, but involved an occasional violent wrench to the thought. Thus the Psalms are made to speak of Christ quite plainly, and of German May-festivals; and the passover is metamorphosed into Easter. Is there not even an allusion to the golden rose given by the pope in the translation of Micah iv, 8?—"Und du Thurm Eder, eine Feste der Tochter Zion, es wird deine goldene Rose kommen." Luther declared his intention of "simply throwing away" any text repugnant to the rest of Scripture, as he conceived it. As a matter of fact the greatest change



that he actually made was the introduction of the word "alone" after "faith" in the passage (Romans iii, 28) "A man is justified by faith without works of the law." Luther never used the word "church" (Kirche), in the Bible, but replaced it by "congregation" (Gemeinde). Following Erasmus he turned *μετανοεῖτε* (Matthew iii, 2, 8) into "bessert euch" ("improve yourselves") instead of "tut Busse" ("do penance") as in the older German versions. Also, following the Erasmian text, he omitted the "comma Johanneum" (I John v, 7); this was first insinuated into the German Bible in 1575.

None of the other vernacular versions, not even the French translation of Lefèvre and Olivetan can compare with the German save one, the English. How William Tyndale began and how Coverdale completed the work in 1535, has been told on another page. Many revisions followed: the Great Bible of 1539, the Geneva Bible of 1560 and the Bishops' Bible of 1568. Then came the Catholic, or Douai version of 1582, the only one completely differing from the others, with its foundation on the Vulgate and its numerous barbarisms: "parasceue" for "preparation," "feast of Azymes" for "feast of unleavened bread," "imposing of hands," "what to me and thee, woman" (John ii, 4), "penance," "chalice," "host," "against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials" (Ephesians vi, 12), "supersubstantial bread" in the Lord's prayer, "he exinanited himself" (Philippians ii, 7).

We are accustomed to speak of the Authorized Version of 1610 as if it were a new product of the literary genius of Shakespeare's age. In fact, it was a mere revision, and a rather light one, of previous work. Its rare perfection of form is due to the labors of many men manipulating and polishing the same material. Like the Homeric poems, like the Greek gospels themselves probably, the greatest English classic is the product of the genius of a race and not of one man. Even from the very beginning it was such to some extent. Tyndale could hardly have known Wyclif's version, which was never printed and was rare in manuscript, but his use of certain words, such as "mote," "beam," and "strait

gate," also found in the earlier version, prove that he was already working in a literary tradition, one generation handing down to another certain Scriptural phrases first heard in the mouths of the Lollards.

Both Tyndale and Coverdale borrowed largely from the German interpreters, as was acknowledged on the title-page and in the prologue to the Bible of 1535. Thus Tyndale copied not only most of the marginal notes of Luther's Bible, but also such Teutonisms as, "this is once bone of my bone," "they offered unto field-devils" (Luther, "Felt-teuffeln"), "Blessed is the room-maker, Gad" (Luther, "Raum-macher"). The English translators also followed the German in using "elder" frequently for "priest," "congregation" for "church," and "love" for "charity." By counting every instance of this and similar renderings, Sir Thomas More claimed to have found one thousand errors in the New Testament alone.

The astounding popularity of the Bible, chiefly but not only in Protestant countries, is witnessed by a myriad voices. Probably in all Christian countries in every age it has been the most read book, but in the sixteenth century it added to an unequalled reputation for infallibility the zest of a new discovery. Edward VI demanding the Bible at his coronation, Elizabeth passionately kissing it at hers, were but types of the time. That joyous princess of the Renaissance, Isabella d'Este, ordered a new translation of the Psalms for her own perusal. Margaret of Navarre, in the Introduction to her frivolous *Heptameron*, expresses the pious hope that all present have read the Scripture. Hundreds of editions of the German and English translations were called for. The people, wrote an Englishman in 1539, "have now in every church and place, almost every man, the Bible and New Testament in their mother tongue, instead of the old fabulous and fantastical books of the Table Round . . . and such other whose impure filth and vain fabulosity the light of God hath abolished there utterly." In Protestant lands it became almost a matter of good form to own the Bible, and reading it has been called, not ineptly, "the *opus operatum* of the Evangelicals." Even the Catholics bore witness to the demand,

which they tried to check. While they admonished the laity that it was unnecessary and dangerous to taste of this tree of knowledge, while they even curtailed the reading of the Scripture by the clergy, they were forced to supply vernacular versions of their own.

Along with unbounded popularity the Bible then enjoyed a much higher reputation for infallibility than it bears today. The one point on which all Protestant churches were agreed was the supremacy and sufficiency of Scripture. The Word, said Calvin, flowed from the very mouth of God himself; it was the sole foundation of faith and the one fountain of all wisdom. "What Christ says must be true whether I or any other man can understand it," preached Luther. "Scripture is fully to be believed," wrote an English theologian, "as a thing necessary to salvation, though the thing contained in Scripture pertain not merely to the faith, as that Aaron had a beard." The Swiss and the Anabaptists added their voices to this chorus of bibliolatry.

Since studies pass into character, it is natural to find a marked effect from this turning loose of a new source of spiritual authority. That thousands were made privately better, wiser and happier from the reading of the gospels and the Hebrew poetry, that standards of morality were raised and ethical tastes purified thereby, is certain. But the same cause had several effects that were either morally indifferent or positively bad. The one chiefly noticed by contemporaries was the pullulation of new sects. Each man, as Luther complained, interpreted the Holy Book according to his own brain and crazy reason. The old saying that the Bible was the book of heretics, came true. It was in vain for the Reformers to insist that none but the ministers (*i. e.* themselves) had the right to interpret Scripture. It was in vain for the governments to forbid, as the Scotch statute expressed it, "any to dispute or hold opinions on the Bible"; discordant clamor of would-be expounders arose, some learned, others ignorant, others fantastic, and all pigheaded and intolerant.

There can be no doubt that the Bible, in proportion to the amount of inerrancy attributed to it, became a stumbling-block in the path of progress, scientific, social and even

moral. It was quoted against Copernicus as it was against Darwin. Rational biblical criticism was regarded by Luther, except when he was the critic, as a cause of vehement suspicion of atheism. Some texts buttressed the horrible and cruel superstition of witchcraft. The examples of the wars of Israel and the text, "compel them to enter in," seemed to support the duty of intolerance. Social reformers, like Vives, in their struggle to abolish poverty, were confronted with the maxim, mistaken as an eternal verity, that the poor are always with us. Finally the great moral lapse of many of the Protestants, the permission of polygamy, was supported by biblical texts.

Next to the Bible the sixteenth century revered the classics. Most of the great Latin authors had been printed prior to 1500, the most important exception being the *Annals* of Tacitus, of which the *editio princeps* was in 1515. Between the years 1478 and 1500, the following Greek works had been published, and in this order: Aesop, Homer, Isocrates, Theocritus, the Anthology, four plays of Euripides, Aristotle, Theognis, and nine plays of Aristophanes. Follow the dates of the *editiones principes* of the other principal Greek writers:

- 1502: Thucydides, Sophocles, Herodotus.
- 1503: Euripides (eighteen plays), Xenophon's *Hellenica*.
- 1504: Demosthenes.
- 1509: Plutarch's *Moralia*.
- 1513: Pindar, Plato.
- 1516: Aristophanes, New Testament, Xenophon, Pausanias, Strabo.
- 1517: Plutarch's *Lives*.
- 1518: Septuagint, Aeschylus, four plays.
- 1525: Galen, Xenophon's complete works.
- 1528: Epictetus.
- 1530: Polybius.
- 1532: Aristophanes, eleven plays.
- 1533: Euclid, Ptolemy.
- 1544: Josephus.

- 1552: Aeschylus, seven plays.
- 1558: Marcus Aurelius.
- 1559: Diodorus.
- 1565: Bion and Moschus.
- 1572: Plutarch's complete works.

Naturally the first editions were not usually the best. The labor of successive generations has made the text what it is. Good work, particularly, though not exclusively, in editing the fathers of the church, was done by Erasmus. But a really new school of historical criticism was created by Joseph Justus Scaliger, the greatest of scholars. His editions of the Latin poets first laid down and applied sound rules of textual emendation, besides elucidating the authors with a wealth of learned comment.

The editing of the texts was but a small portion of the labor that went to the cultivation of the classics. The foundations of our modern lexicons were laid in the great *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* of Robert Estienne (first edition 1532, 2d improved 1536, 3d in three volumes 1543) and the *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* by Henry Estienne the younger, published in five volumes in 1572. This latter is still used, the best edition being that in nine volumes 1829-63.

So much of ancient learning has become a matter of course to the modern student that he does not always realize the amount of ground covered in the last four centuries. Erasmus once wrote to Cardinal Grimani: "The Roman Capitol, to which the ancient poets vainly promised eternity, has so completely disappeared that its very location cannot be pointed out." If one of the greatest scholars then was ignorant of a site now visited by every tourist in the Eternal City, how much must there not have been to learn in other respects? Devotedly and successfully the contemporaries and successors of Erasmus labored to supply the knowledge then wanting. Latin, Greek and Hebrew grammars were written, treatises on Roman coinage, on epigraphy, on ancient religion, on chronology, on comparative philology, on Roman law, laid deep and strong the foundations of the consummate scholarship of modern times.



The classics were not only studied in the sixteenth century, they were loved, they were even worshipped. "Every elegant study, every science worthy of the attention of an educated man, in a word, whatever there is of polite learning," wrote the French savant Muret, "is contained nowhere save in the literature of the Greeks." Joachim du Bellay wrote a cycle of sonnets on the antiquities of Rome, in the spirit:

Rome fut tout le monde, et tout le monde est Rome.

"The Latin allureth me by its gracious dignity," wrote Montaigne, "and the writings of the Greeks not only fill and satisfy me, but transfix me with admiration. . . . What glory can compare with that of Homer?" Machiavelli tells how he dressed each evening in his best attire to be worthy to converse with the spirits of the ancients, and how, while reading them, he forgot all the woes of life and the terror of death. Almost all learned works, and a great many not learned, were written in Latin. For those who could not read the classics for themselves translations were supplied. Perhaps the best of these were the *Lives of Famous Men* by Plutarch, first rendered into French by Amyot and thence into English by Sir Thomas North.

Strong, buoyant, self-confident as was the spirit of the age, it bore plainly upon it the impress of its zealous schooling in the lore of the ancients. In supplying the imperious need of cultured men for good literature the Romans and Greeks had, in the year 1500, but few rivals—save in Italy, hardly any. To an age that had much to learn they had much to teach; to men as greedy for the things of the mind as they were for luxury and wealth the classics offered a new world as rich in spoils of wisdom and beauty as were the East Indies and Peru in spices and gold. The supreme value of the Greek and Latin books is that which they have in common with all literature; they furnished, for the mass of reading men, the best and most copious supply of food for the intellectual and spiritual life. "Books," says Erasmus, "are both cheering and wholesome. In prosperity they steady

one, in affliction console, do not vary with fortune and follow one through all dangers even to the grave. . . . What wealth or what scepters would I exchange for my tranquil reading?" "From my earliest childhood," Montaigne confides, "poetry has had the power to pierce me through and transport me."

In the best sense of the word, books are popular philosophy. All cannot study the deepest problems of life or of science for themselves, but all can absorb the quintessence of thought in the pleasant and stimulating form in which it is served up in the best literature. Books accustom men to take pleasure in ideas and to cultivate a high and noble inward life. This, their supreme value for the moulding of character, was appreciated in the sixteenth century. "We must drink the spirit of the classics," observes Montaigne, "rather than learn their precepts," and again, "the use to which I put my studies is a practical one—the formation of character for the exigencies of life."

This is the service by which the ancients have put the moderns in their debt. Another gift of distinct, though lesser value, was that of literary style. So close is the correspondence between expression and thought that it is no small advantage to any man or to any age to sit at the feet of those supreme masters of the art of saying things well, the Greeks. The danger here was from literal imitation. Erasmus, with habitual wit, ridiculed the Ciceronian who spent years in constructing sentences that might have been written by his master, who speaks of Jehovah as Jupiter and of Christ as Cecrops or Iphigenia, and who transmutes the world around him into a Roman empire with tribunes and augurs, consuls and allies. It is significant that the English word "pedant" was coined in the sixteenth century.

What the classics had to teach directly was not only of less value than their indirect influence, but was often positively harmful. Those who, intoxicated with the pagan spirit, sought to regulate their lives by the moral standards of the poets, fell into the same error, though into the opposite vices, as those who deified the letter of the Bible. Like the Bible the classics were, and are, to some extent obstacles to

the march of science, and this not only because they take men's interest from the study of nature, but because most ancient philosophers from the time of Socrates spoke contemptuously of natural experiment and discovery as things of little or no value to the soul.

If for the finer spirits of the age a classical education furnished a noble instrument of culture, for all too many it was prized simply as a badge of superiority. Among a people that stands in awe of learning—and this is more true of Europe than of America and was more true of the sixteenth than it is of the twentieth century—a classical education offers a man exceptional facilities for delicately impressing inferiors with their crudity.

The period that marked high water in the estimation of the classics, also saw the turn of the tide. In all countries the vernacular crowded the classics ever backward from the field. The conscious cultivation of the modern tongues was marked by the publication of new dictionaries and by various works such as John Bale's history of English literature, written itself, to be sure, in Latin. The finest work of the kind was Joachim du Bellay's *Défence et Illustration de la langue française* published in 1549 as part of a concerted effort to raise French to a vehicle of poetry and prose to a level with the classics. This was done partly by borrowing from Latin. One of the characteristic words of the sixteenth century, "patrie," was thus formally introduced.

## § 2. History

For the examination of the interests and temper of a given era, hardly any better gauge can be found than the history it produced. In the period under consideration there were two great schools, or currents, of historiography, the humanistic, sprung from the Renaissance, and church history, the child of the Reformation.

The devotees of the first illustrate most aptly what has just been said about the influence of the classics. Their supreme interest was style, generally Latin. To clothe a chronicle in the toga of Livy's periods, to deck it out with the rhetoric of Sallust and to stitch on a few antitheses and

epigrams in the manner of Tacitus, seemed to them the height of art. Their choice of matter was as characteristic as their manner, in that their interest was exclusively political and aristocratic. Save the doings of courts and camps, the political intrigues of governments and the results of battles, together with the virtues and vices of the rulers, they saw little in history. What the people thought, felt and suffered, was beyond their purview. Nor did most of them have much interest in art, science or literature, or even in religion. When George Buchanan, a man in the thick of the Scottish Reformation, who drafted the *Book of Articles*, came to write the history of his own time, he was so obsessed with the desire to imitate the ancient Romans that he hardly mentioned the religious controversy at all. One sarcasm on the priests who thought the *New Testament* was written by Luther, and demanded their good *Old Testament* back again, two brief allusions to Knox, and a few other passing references are all of the Reformation that comes into a bulky volume dealing with the reigns of James V and Mary Stuart. His interest in political liberty, his conception of the struggle as one between tyranny and freedom, might appear modern were it not so plainly rooted in antique soil.

The prevailing vice of the humanists—to see in the story of a people nothing but a political lesson—is carried to its extreme by Machiavelli. Writing with all the charm that conquers time, this theorist altered facts to suit his thesis to the point of composing historical romances. His *Life of Castruccio* is as fictitious and as didactic as Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*; his *Commentary on Livy* is as much a treatise on politics as is *The Prince*; the *History of Florence* is but slightly hampered by the events.

If Guicciardini's interest in politics is not less exclusive than that of his compatriot, he is vastly superior as a historian to the older man in that, whereas Machiavelli deduced history *a priori* from theory, Guicciardini had a real desire to follow the inductive method of deriving his theory from an accurate mastery of the facts. With superb analytical reasoning he presents his data, marshals them and draws from them the conclusions they will bear. The limitation

that vitiates many of his deductions is his taking into account only low and selfish motives. Before idealists he stands helpless; he leaves the reader uncertain whether Savonarola was a prophet or an extremely astute politician.

The advance that Paul Jovius marks over the Florentines lies in the appeal that he made to the interests of the general public. History had hitherto been written for the greater glory of a patron or at most of a city; Jovius saw that the most generous patron of genius must henceforth be the average reader. It is true that he despised the public for whom he wrote, stuffing them with silly anecdotes. Both as the first great interviewer and reporter for the history of his own times, and in paying homage to Mrs. Grundy by assuming an air of virtue not natural to him, he anticipated the modern journalist.

So much more modern in point of view than his contemporaries was Polydore Vergil—whose *English History* appeared in 1534—that the generalizations about humanist historiography are only partially true of him. Though his description of land and people is perhaps modelled on Herodotus, it shows a genuine interest in the life of the common man, even of the poor. He noted the geography, climate and fauna of the island; his eyes saw London Bridge with its rows of shops on either side, and they admired the parks full of game, the apple orchards, the fat hens and pheasants, the ploughs drawn by mixed teams of horses and oxen; he even observed the silver salt-cellars, spoons and cups used by the poor, and their meals of meat. His description of the people as brave, hospitable and very religious is as true now as it was then. With an antiquary's interest in old manuscripts Vergil combined a philosopher's skepticism of old legends. This Italian, though his patron was Henry VIII, balanced English and French authorities and told the truth even in such delicate matters as the treatment of Joan of Arc. Political history was for him still the most important, although to one branch of it, constitutional history, he was totally blind. So were almost all Englishmen then, even Shakespeare, whose *King John* contains no allusion to Magna Charta. In his work *On the Inventors of Things*



Vergil showed the depth of his insight into the importance in history of culture and ideas. While his treatment of such subjects as the origin of myths, man, marriage, religion, language, poetry, drama, music, sciences and laws is unequal to his purpose, the intention itself bears witness to a new and fruitful spirit.

Neither France nor England nor Germany produced historians equal to those of Italian or of Scottish birth. France was the home of the memoir, personal, chatty, spicy and unphilosophic. Those of Blaise de Montluc are purely military, those of Brantôme are mostly scandalous. Martin du Bellay tried to impart a higher tone to his reminiscences, while with Hotman a school of pamphleteers arose to yoke history with political theory. John Bodin attempted without much success the difficult task of writing a philosophy of history. His chief contribution was the theory of geography and climate as determinant influences.

It is hard to see any value, save occasionally as sources, in the popular English chronicles of Edward Hall, Raphael Hollinshed and John Stow. Full of court gossip and of pageantry, strongly royalist, conservative and patriotic, they reflect the interests of the middle-class cockney as faithfully as does a certain type of newspaper and magazine today.

The biography and autobiography were cultivated with considerable success. Jovius and Brantôme both wrote series of lives of eminent men and women. Though the essays of Erasmus in this direction are both few and brief, they are notable as among the most exquisite pen-portraits in literature. More ambitious and more notable were the *Lives of the Best Painters, Sculptors and Architects* by George Vasari, in which the whole interest was personal and practical, with no attempt to write a history or a philosophy of art. Even criticism was confined almost entirely to variations of praise. In the realm of autobiography Benvenuto Cellini attained to the *non plus ultra* of self-revelation. If he discloses the springs of a rare artistic genius, with equal naïveté he lays bare a ruffianly character and a colossal egotism.

One immense field of human thought and action had been all but totally ignored by the humanist historians—

that of religion. To cultivate this field a new genre, church history, sprang into being, though the felt want was not then for a rational explanation of important and neglected phenomena, but for material which each side in the religious controversy might forge into weapons to use against the other. The natural result of so practical a purpose was that history was studied through colored spectacles, and was interpreted with strong tendency. In the most honest hands, such as those of Sleidan, the scale was unconsciously weighted on one side; by more passionate or less honorable advocates it was deliberately lightened with suppression of the truth on one side and loaded with suggestion of the false on the other.

If the mutual animosity of Catholic and Protestant narrowed history, their common detestation of all other religions than Christianity, as well as of all heresies and skepticisms, probably impoverished it still more. Orthodox Christianity, with its necessary preparation, ancient Judaism, was set apart as divinely revealed over against all other faiths and beliefs, which at best were "the beastly devices of the heathen" and at worst the direct inspiration of the devils. Few were the men who, like Erasmus, could compare Christ with Socrates, Plato and Seneca; fewer still those who could say with Franck, "Heretic is a title of honor, for truth is always called heresy." The names of Marcion and Pelagius, Epicurus and Mahomet, excited a passion of hatred hardly comprehensible to us. The refutation of the Koran issued under Luther's auspices would have been ludicrous had it not been pitiful.

In large part this vicious interpretation of history was bequeathed to the Reformers by the Middle Ages. As Augustine set the City of God over against the city of destruction, so the Protestant historians regarded the human drama as a puppet show in which God and the devil pulled the strings. Institutions of which they disapproved, such as the papacy and monasticism, were thought to be adequately explained by the suggestion of their Satanic origin. A thin, wan line of witnesses passed the truth down, like buckets of water a

a fire, from its source in the Apostolic age to the time of the writer.

Even with such handicaps to weigh it down, the study of church history did much good. A vast body of new sources were uncovered and ransacked. The appeal to an objective standard slowly but surely forced its lesson on the litigants before the bar of truth. Writing under the eye of vigilant critics one cannot forever suppress or distort inconvenient facts. The critical dagger, at first sharpened only to stab an enemy, became a scalpel to cut away many a foreign growth. With larger knowledge came, though slowly, fairer judgment and deeper human interest. In these respects there was vast difference between the individual writers. To condemn them all to the Malebolge deserved only by the worst is indiscriminating.

Among the most industrious and the most biassed must certainly be numbered Matthew Flacius Illyricus and his collaborators in producing the *Magdeburg Centuries*, a vast history of the church to the year 1300, which aimed at making Protestant polemic independent of Catholic sources. Save for the accumulation of much material it deserves no praise. Its critical principles are worse than none, for its only criterion of sources is as they are pro- or anti-papal. The latter are taken and the former left. Miracles are not doubted as such, but are divided into two classes, those tending to prove an accepted doctrine which are true, and those which support some papal institution which are branded as "first-class lies." The correspondence between Christ and King Abgarus is used as not having been proved a forgery, and the absurd legend of the female Pope Joan is never doubted. The psychology of the authors is as bad as their criticism. All opposition to the pope, especially that of the German Emperors, is represented as caused by religion.

However poor was the work of the authors of the *Magdeburg Centuries*, they were at least honest in arraying their sources. This is more than can be said of Caesar Baronius, whose *Annales Ecclesiastici* was the official Catholic counterblast to the Protestant work. Whereas his criticism is no whit

better than theirs, he adopted the cunning policy, unfortunately widely obtaining since his day, of simply ignoring or suppressing unpleasant facts, rather than of refuting the inferences drawn from them. His talent for switching the attention to a side-issue, and for tangling instead of clearing problems, made the Protestants justly regard him as "a great deceiver" though even the most learned of them, J. J. Scaliger, who attempted to refute him, found the work difficult.

Naturally the battle of the historians waxed hottest over the Reformation itself. A certain class of Protestant works, of which Crespin's *Book of Martyrs*, Beza's *Ecclesiastical History* and John Foxe's *Acts and Monuments* (first English edition, 1563), are examples, catered to the passions of the multitude by laying the stress of their presentation on the heroism and sufferings of the witnesses to the faith and the cruelty of the persecutors. For many men the detailed description of isolated facts has a certain "thickness" of reality—if I may borrow William James's phrase—that is found by more complex minds only in the deduction of general causes. Passionate, partisan and sometimes ribald, Foxe won the reward that waits on demagogues. When it came to him as an afterthought to turn his book of martyrs into a general history, he plagiarized the *Magdeburg Centuries*. The reliability of his original narrative has been impugned with some success, though it has not been fully or impartially investigated. Much of it being drawn from personal recollection or from unpublished records, its sole value consists for us in its accuracy. I have compared a small section of the work with the manuscript source used by Foxe and have made the rather surprising discovery that though there are wide variations, none of them can be referred to partisan bias or to any other conceivable motive. In this instance, which is too small to generalize, it is possible that Foxe either had supplementary information, or that he wrote from a careless memory. In any case his work must be used with caution.

Much superior to the work of Foxe was John Knox's *History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland* (written 1559-71). In style it is rapid, with a

rare gift for seizing the essential and a no less rare humor and command of sarcasm. Its intention to be "a faithful rehearsal of such personages as God has made instruments of his glory," though thus equivocally stated, is carried out in an honorable sense. It is true that the writer never harbored a doubt that John Knox himself was the chiefest instrument of God's glory, nor that "the Roman Kirk is the synagogue of Satan and the head thereof, called the pope, that man of sin of whom the apostle speaketh." If, in such an avowed apology, one does not get impartiality, neither is one misled by expecting it. Knox's honor consists only in this—that, as a party pamphleteer, he did not falsify or suppress essential facts as he understood them himself.

In glaring contrast to Knox's obtrusive bias, is the fair appearance of impartiality presented in Henry Bullinger's *History of the Reformation* 1519-32. Here, too, we meet with excellent composition, but with a studied moderation of phrase. It is probable that the author's professions of fairness are sincere, though at times the temptation to omit recording unedifying facts, such as the sacramentarian schism, is too strong for him.

Before passing judgment on anything it is necessary to know it at its best. Probably John Sleidan's *Religious and political History of the reign of Charles V* was the best work on the German Reformation written before the eighteenth century. Bossuet was more eloquent and acute, Seckendorf more learned, Gilbert Burnet had better perspective, but none of these writers was better informed than Sleidan, or as objective. For the first and only time he really combined the two genres then obtaining, the humanistic and the ecclesiastical. He is not blind to some of the cultural achievements of the Reformation. One of the things for which he praises Luther most is for ornamenting and enriching the German language. Sleidan's faults are those of his age. He dared not break the old stiff division of the subject by years. He put in a number of insignificant facts, such as the flood of the Tiber and the explosion of ammunition dumps, nor was he above a superstitious belief in the effects of eclipses and in monsters. He cited documents



broadly and on the whole fairly, but not with painstaking accuracy. He offered nothing on the causes leading up to the Reformation, nor on the course of the development of Protestantism, nor on the characters of its leaders nor on the life and thought of the people. But he wrote fluently, acceptably to his public, and temperately.

On the whole, save for Baronius, the Catholics had less to offer of notable histories than had the Protestants. A *succès de scandale* was won by Nicholas Sanders' *Origin and Progress of the English Schism*. Among the nasty bits of gossip with which "Dr. Slanders," as he was called, delighted to regale his audience, some are absurd, such as that Anne Boleyn was Henry VIII's daughter. As the books from which he says he took these anecdotes are not extant, it is impossible to gauge how far he merely copied from others and how far he gave rein to his imagination.

The one brilliant bit of Catholic church history that was written in the sixteenth century is the autobiography of Ignatius Loyola, dictated by him to Lewis Gonzalez and taken down partly in Spanish and partly in Italian. The great merit of this narrative is its insight into the author's own character gained by long years of careful self-observation. Its whole emphasis is psychological, on the inner struggle and not on the outward manifestations of saintliness, such as visions. It was taken over in large part verbatim in Ribadeneira's biography of Loyola. Compared to it, all other attempts at ecclesiastical biography in the sixteenth century, notably the lives of Luther by the Catholic Cochlaeus and by the Protestant Mathesius, lag far in the dusty rear.

### § 3. Political Theory

The great era of the state naturally shone in political thought. Though there was some scientific investigation of social and economic laws, thought was chiefly conditioned by the new problems to be faced. From the long medieval dream of a universal empire and a universal church, men awoke to find themselves in the presence of new entities, created, to be sure, by their own spirits, but all unwittingly.

One of these was the national state, whose essence was power and the law of whose life was expansion to the point of meeting equal or superior force. No other factor in history, not even religion, has produced so many wars as has the clash of national egotisms sanctified by the name of patriotism. Within the state the shift of sovereignty from the privileged orders to the bourgeoisie necessitated the formulation of a new theory. It was the triumph, with the rich, of the monarchy and of the parliaments, that pointed the road of some publicists to a doctrine of the divine right of kings, and others to distinctly republican conclusions. There were even a few egalitarians who claimed for all classes a democratic régime. And, thirdly, the Reformation gave a new turn to the old problem of the relationship of church and state. It was on premises gathered from these three phenomena that the publicists of that age built a dazzling structure of political thought.

It was chiefly the first of these problems that absorbed the attention of Nicholas Machiavelli, the most brilliant, the most studied and the most abused of political theorists. As between monarchy and a republic he preferred, on the whole, the former, as likely to be the stronger, but he clearly saw that where economic equality prevailed political equality was natural and inevitable. The masses, he thought, desired only security of person and property, and would adhere to either form of government that offered them the best chance of these. For republic and monarchy alike Machiavelli was ready to offer maxims of statecraft, those for the former embodied in his *Discourses on Livy*, those for the latter in his *Prince*. In erecting a new science of statecraft, by which a people might arrive at supreme dominion, Machiavelli's great merit is that he looked afresh at the facts and discarded the old, worn formulas of the schoolmen; his great defect is that he set before his mind as a premise an abstract "political man" as far divorced from living, breathing, complex reality as the "economic man" of Ricardo. Men, he thought, are always the same, governed by calculable mo-

tives of self-interest. In general, he thought, men are ungrateful, fickle, false, cowardly and covetous, to be ruled partly by an appeal to their greed, but chiefly by fear.

Realist as he professed to be, Machiavelli divorced politics from morality. Whereas for Aristotle<sup>1</sup> and Aquinas alike the science of politics is a branch of ethics, for Machiavelli it is an abstract science as totally dissociated from morality as is mathematics or surgery. The prince, according to Machiavelli, should appear to be merciful, faithful, humane, religious and upright, but should be able to act otherwise without the least scruple when it is to his advantage to do so. His heroes are Ferdinand of Aragon, "a prince who always preaches good faith but never practises it," and Caesar Borgia, "who did everything that can be done by a prudent and virtuous man; so that no better precepts can be offered to a new prince than those suggested by the example of his actions." What the Florentine publicist especially admired in Caesar's statecraft were some examples of consummate perfidy and violence which he had the opportunity of observing at first hand. Machiavelli made a sharp distinction between private and public virtue. The former he professed to regard as binding on the individual, as it was necessary to the public good. It is noteworthy that this advocate of all hypocrisy and guile and violence on the part of the government was in his own life gentle, affectionate and true to trust. Religion Machiavelli regarded as a valuable instrument of tyranny, but he did not hold the view, attributed by Gibbon to Roman publicists that all religions, though to the philosopher equally false were to the statesman equally useful. Christianity he detested not so much as an exploded superstition, as because he saw in it theoretically the negation of those patriotic, military virtues of ancient Rome, and because practically the papacy had prevented the union of Italy. Naturally Machiavelli cherished the army as the prime interest of the state. In advocating a national militia with universal training of citizens he anticipated the conscript armies of the nineteenth century.

This writer, speaking the latent though unavowed ideals of

<sup>1</sup> In Greek the words "politics" and "ethics" both have a wider meaning than they have in English.

an evil generation of public men, was rewarded by being openly vilified and secretly studied. He became the manual of statesmen and the bugbear of moralists. While Catherine de' Medici, Thomas Cromwell and Francis Bacon chewed, swallowed and digested his pages, the dramatist had only to put in a sneer or an abusive sarcasm at the expense of the Florentine—and there were very many such allusions to him on the Elizabethan stage—to be sure of a round of applause from the audience. While Machiavelli found few open defenders, efforts to refute him were numerous. When Reginald Pole said that his works were written by the evil one a chorus of Jesuits sang amen and the church put his writings on the Index. The Huguenots were not less vociferous in opposition. Among them Innocent Gentillet attacked not only his morals but his talent, saying that his maxims were drawn from an observation of small states only, and that his judgment of the policy suitable to large nations was of the poorest.

It is fair to try *The Prince* by the author's own standards. He did not purpose, in Bacon's phrase, to describe what men ought to be but what they actually are: he put aside ethical ideas not as false but as irrelevant. But this rejection was fatal even to his own purpose, "for what he put aside . . . were nothing less than the living forces by which societies subsist and governments are strong."<sup>2</sup> Calvin succeeded where the Florentine failed, as Lord Morley points out, because he put the moral ideal first.

The most striking contrast to Machiavelli was not forthcoming from the camp of the Reformers, but from that of the northern humanists, Erasmus and More. The *Institution of a Christian Prince*, by the Dutch scholar, is at the antipodes of the Italian thesis. Virtue is inculcated as the chief requisite of a prince, who can be considered good only in proportion as he fosters the wealth and the education of his people. He should levy no taxes, if possible, but should live parsimoniously off his own estate. He should never make war, save when absolutely necessary, even against the Infidel, and should negotiate only such treaties as have for their principal object the prevention of armed conflict.

<sup>2</sup> Lord Morley.

Still more noteworthy than his moral postulates, is Erasmus's preference for the republican form of government. In the *Christian Prince*, dedicated as it was to the emperor, he spoke as if kings might and perhaps ought to be elected, but in his *Adages* he interpreted the spirit of the ancients in a way most disparaging to monarchy. Considering how carefully this work was studied by promising youths at the impressionable age, it is not too much to regard it as one of the main sources of the marked republican current of thought throughout the century. Under the heading, "Fools and kings are born such," he wrote: "In all history, ancient and recent you will scarcely find in the course of several centuries one or two princes, who, by their signal folly, did not bring ruin on humanity." In another place, after a similar remark, he continues:

I know not whether much of this is not to be imputed to ourselves. We trust the rudder of a vessel, where a few sailors and some goods alone are in jeopardy, to none but skilful pilots; but the state, wherein is comprised the safety of so many thousands, we leave to the guidance of any chance hands. A charioteer must learn, reflect upon and practice his art; a prince needs only to be born. Yet government is the most difficult, as it is the most honorable, of sciences. Shall we choose the master of a ship and not choose him who is to have the care of so many cities and so many souls? . . . Do we not see that noble cities are erected by the people and destroyed by princes? that a state grows rich by the industry of its citizens and is plundered by the rapacity of its princes? that good laws are enacted by elected magistrates and violated by kings? that the people love peace and the princes foment war?

There is far too much to the same purpose to quote, which in all makes a polemic against monarchy not exceeded by the fiercest republicans of the next two generations. It is true that Erasmus wrote all this in 1515, and half took it back after the Peasants' War. "Princes must be endured," he the



thought, "lest tyranny give place to anarchy, a still greater evil."

As one of the principal causes of the Reformation was the strengthening of national self-consciousness, so conversely one of the most marked results of the movement was the exaltation of the state. The Reformation began to realize, though at first haltingly, the separation of church and state, and it endowed the latter with much wealth, with many privileges and with high prerogatives and duties up to that time belonging to the former. It is true that all the innovators would have recoiled from bald Erastianism, which is not found in the theses of Thomas Erastus, but in the free-thinker Thomas Hobbes. Whereas the Reformers merely said that the state should be charged with the duty of enforcing orthodoxy and punishing sinners, Hobbes drew the logical inference that the state was the final authority for determining religious truth. That Hobbes's conclusion was only the *reductio ad absurdum* of the Reformation doctrine was hidden from the Reformers themselves by their very strong belief in an absolute and ascertainable religious truth.

The tendency of both Luther and Calvin to exalt the state took two divergent forms according to their understanding of what the state was. Lutheranism became the ally of absolute monarchy, whereas Calvinism had in it a republican element. It is no accident that Germany developed a form of government in which a paternal but bureaucratic care of the people supplied the place of popular liberty, whereas America, on the whole the most Calvinistic of the great states, carried to its logical conclusion the idea of the rule of the majority. The English Reformation was at first Lutheran in this respect, but after 1580 it began to take the strong Calvinistic tendency that led to the Commonwealth.

While Luther cared enormously for social reform, and did valiant service in its cause, he harbored a distrust of the people that grates harshly on modern ears. Especially after the excesses of the Peasants' War and the extravagance of Münzer, he came to believe that "Herr Omnes" was capable of little good and much evil. "The princes of this world are

gods," he once said, "the common people are Satan, through whom God sometimes does what at other times he does directly through Satan, *i.e.*, makes rebellion as a punishment for the people's sins." And again: "I would rather suffer a prince doing wrong than a people doing right." Passive obedience to the divinely ordained "powers that be" was therefore the sole duty of the subject. "It is in no wise proper for anyone who would be a Christian to set himself up against his government, whether it act justly or unjustly," he wrote in 1530.

That Luther turned to the prince as the representative of the divine majesty in the state is due not only to Scriptural authority but to the fact that there was no material for any other form of government to be found in Germany. He was no sycophant, nor had he any illusions as to the character of hereditary monarchs. In his *Treatise on Civil Authority*, dedicated to his own sovereign, Duke John of Saxony, he wrote: "Since the foundation of the world a wise prince has been a rare bird and a just one much rarer. They are generally the biggest fools and worst knaves on earth, wherefore one must always expect the worst of them and not much good, especially in divine matters." They distinctly have not the right, he adds, to decide spiritual things, but only to enforce the decisions of the Christian community.

Feeling the necessity for some bridle in the mouth of the emperor and finding no warrant for the people to curb him, Luther groped for the notion of some legal limitation on the monarch's power. The word "constitution" so familiar to us, was lacking then, but that the idea was present is certain. The German Empire had a constitution, largely unwritten but partly statutory. The limitations on the imperial power were then recognized by an Italian observer, Quirini. When they were brought to Luther's attention he admitted the right of the German states to resist by force imperial acts of injustice contrary to positive laws. Moreover, he always maintained that no subject should obey an order directly contravening the law of God. In these limitations on the government's power, slight as they were, were contained the germs of the later Calvinistic constitutionalism.

While many of the Reformers—Melancthon, Bucer, Tyn-ale—were completely in accord with Luther's earlier doctrine of passive obedience, the Swiss, French and Scotch developed a consistent body of constitutional theory destined to guide the peoples into ordered liberty. Doubtless an influence of prime importance in the Reformed as distinct from the Lutheran church, was the form of ecclesiastical government. Congregationalism and Presbyterianism are practical object-lessons in democracy. Many writers have justly pointed out in the case of America the influence of the vestry in the evolution of the town meeting. In other countries the same cause operated in the same way, giving the British and French Protestants ample practice in representative government. Zwingli asserted that the subject should refuse to act contrary to his faith. From the Middle Ages he took the doctrine of the identity of spiritual and civil authority, but he also postulated the sovereignty of the people, as was natural in a free-born Switzer. In fact, his sympathies were republican through and through.

The clear political thinking of Calvin and his followers was in large part the result of the exigencies of their situation. Confronted with established power they were forced to defend themselves with pen as well as with sword. In France, especially, the ember of their thought was blown into fierce flame by the winds of persecution. Not only the Huguenots took fire, but all their neighbors, until the kingdom of France seemed on the point of anticipating the great Revolution by two centuries.

With the tocsins ringing in his ears, jangling discordantly with the servile doctrines of Paul and Luther, Calvin set to work to forge a theory that should combine liberty with order. Carrying a step further than had his masters the separation of civil and ecclesiastical authority, he yet regarded civil government as the most sacred and honorable of all merely human institutions. The form he preferred was an aristocracy, but where monarchy prevailed, Calvin was not prepared to recommend its overthrow, save in extreme cases. Grasping at Luther's idea of constitutional, or contractual, limitations on the royal power, he asserted that the king

should be resisted, when he violated his rights, not by private men but by elected magistrates to whom the guardianship of the people's rights should be particularly entrusted. The high respect in which Calvin was held, and the clearness and comprehensiveness of his thought made him ultimately the most influential of the Protestant publicists. By his doctrine the Dutch, English, and American nations were educated to popular sovereignty.

The seeds of liberty sown by Calvin might well have remained long hidden in the ground, had not the soil of France been irrigated with blood and scorched by the tyranny of the last Valois. Theories of popular rights, which sprang up with the luxuriance of the jungle after the day of St. Bartholomew, were already sprouting some years before it. The Estates General that met at Paris in March, 1561, demanded that the regency be put in the hands of Henry of Navarre and that the members of the house of Lorraine and the Chancellor L'Hôpital be removed from all offices as not having been appointed by the Estates. In August of the same year thirty-nine representatives of the three Estates of thirteen provinces met, contemporaneously with the religious Colloquy of Poissy, at Pontoise, and there voiced with great boldness the claims of constitutional government. They demanded the right of the Estates to govern during the minority of the king; they claimed that the Estates should be summoned at least biennially; they forbade taxation, alienation of the royal domain or declaration of war without their consent. The further resolution that the persecution of the Huguenots should cease, betrayed the quarter from which the popular party drew its strength.

But if the voices of the brave deputies hardly carried beyond the senate-chamber, a host of pamphlets, following hard upon the great massacre, trumpeted the sounds of freedom to the four winds. Theodore Beza published anonymously his *Rights of Magistrates*, developing Calvin's theory that the representatives of the people should be empowered to put a bridle on the king. The pact between the people and king is said to be abrogated if the king violates it.

At the same time another French Protestant, Francis Ho

man, published his *Franco-Gallia*, to show that France had an ancient and inviolable constitution. This unwritten law regulates the succession to the throne; by it the deputies hold their privileges in the Estates General; by it the laws, binding even on the king, are made. The right of the people can be shown, in Hotman's opinion, to extend even to deposing the monarch and electing his successor.

A higher and more general view was taken in the *Rights against Tyrants* published under the pseudonym of Stephen Junius Brutus the Celt, and written by Philip du Plessis-Mornay. This brief but comprehensive survey, addressed to both Catholics and Protestants, and aimed at Machiavelli as the chief supporter of tyranny, advanced four theses: 1. Subjects are bound to obey God rather than the king. This is regarded as self-evident. 2. If the king devastates the church and violates God's law, he may be resisted at least passively as far as private men are concerned, but actively by magistrates and cities. The author, who quotes from the Bible and ancient history, evidently has contemporary France in mind. 3. The people may resist a tyrant who is oppressing or ruining the state. Originally, in the author's view, the people either elected the king, or confirmed him, and if they have not exercised this right for a long time it is a legal maxim that no prescription can run against the public claims. Laws derive their sanction from the people, and should be made by them; taxes may only be levied by their representatives, and the king who exacts imposts of his own will is in no wise different from an enemy. The kings are not even the owners of public property, but only its administrators, are bound by the contract with the governed, and may be rightly punished for violating it. 4. The fourth thesis advanced by Mornay is that foreign aid may justly be called in against a tyrant.

Not relying exclusively on their own talents the Huguenots were able to press into the ranks of their army of pamphleteers some notable Catholics. In 1574 they published as a fragment, and in 1577 entire, *The Discourse on Voluntary Servitude*, commonly called the *Contr'un*, by Stephen de la Boétie. This gentleman, dying at the age of thirty-three, had left all his manuscripts to his bosom friend Montaigne. The



latter says that La Boétie composed the work as a prize declamation at the age of sixteen or eighteen. But along with many passages in the pamphlet, which might have been suggested by Erasmus, are several allusions that seem to point to the character of Henry III—in 1574 king of Poland and in 1577 king of France—and to events just prior to the time of publication. According to an attractive hypothesis, not fully proved, these passages were added by Montaigne himself before he gave the work to one of his several Huguenot friends or kinsmen. La Boétie, at any rate, appealed to the passions aroused by St. Bartholomew in bidding the people no longer to submit to one man, "the most wretched and effeminate of the nation," who has only two hands, two eyes, and who will fall if unsupported. And yet, he goes on rhetorically, "you sow the fruits of the earth that he may waste them; you furnish your houses for him to pillage them; you rear your daughters to glut his lust and your sons to perish in his wars; . . . you exhaust your bodies in labor that he may wallow in vile pleasures."

As Montaigne and La Boétie were Catholics, it is pertinent here to remark that tyranny produced much the same effect on its victims, whatever their religion. The Sorbonne, consulted by the League, unanimously decided that the people of France were freed from their oath of allegiance to Henry III and could with a good conscience take arms against him. One of the doctors, Boucher, wrote to prove that the church and the people had the right to depose an assassin, a perjurer, an impious or heretical prince, or one guilty of sacrilege or witchcraft. A tyrant, he concluded, was a wild beast whom it was lawful for the state as a whole or even for private individuals, to kill.

So firmly established did the doctrine of the contract between prince and people become that towards the end of the century one finds it taken for granted. The *Mémoires* of the Huguenot soldier, poet and historian Agrippa d'Aubigné are full of republican sentiments, as, for example, "There is no binding obligation between the king and his subjects," and "The power of the prince proceeds from the people."

But it must not be imagined that such doctrines passed without challenge. The most important writer on political science after Machiavelli, John Bodin, was on the whole a conservative. In his writings acute and sometimes profound remarks jostle quaint and abject superstitions. He hounded the government and the mob on witches with the vile zeal of the authors of the *Witches' Hammer*; and he examined all existing religions with the coolness of a philosopher. He urged on the attention of the world that history was determined in general by natural causes, such as climate, but that revolutions were caused partly by the inscrutable will of God and partly by the more ascertainable influence of planets.

His most famous work, *The Republic*, is a criticism of Machiavelli and an attempt to bring politics back into the domain of morality. He defines a state as a company of men united for the purpose of living well and happily; he thinks it arose from natural right and social contract. For the first time Bodin differentiates the state from the government, defining sovereignty (*majestas*) as the attribute of the former. He classifies governments in the usual three categories, and refuses to believe in mixed governments. Though England puzzles him, he regards her as an absolute monarchy. This is the form that he decidedly prefers, for he calls the people a many-headed monster and says that the majority of men are incompetent and bad. Preaching passive obedience to the king, he finds no check on him, either by tyrannicide or by constitutional magistrates, save only in the judgment of God.

It is singular that after Bodin had removed all effective checks on the tyrant in this world, he should lay it down as a principle that no king should levy taxes without his subjects' consent. Another contradiction is that whereas he frees the subject from the duty of obedience in case the monarch commands aught against God's law, he treats religion almost as a matter of policy, advising that, whatever it be, the statesman should not disturb it. Apart from the streak of superstition in his mind, his inconsistencies are due to the attempt to reconcile opposites—Machiavelli and Calvin. For with all his denunciation of the former's atheism and immorality, he,

with his chauvinism, his defence of absolutism, his practical opportunism, is not so far removed from the Florentine as he would have us believe.

The revolution that failed in France succeeded in the Netherlands, and some contribution to political theory can be found in the constitution drawn up by the States General in 1580, when they recognized Anjou as their prince, and in the document deposing Philip in 1581. Both assume fully the sovereignty of the people and the omniscience of their elected representatives. As Oldenbarnevelt commented, "The cities and nobles together represent the whole state and the whole people." The deposition of Philip is justified by an appeal to the law of nature, and to the example of other tortured states, and by a recital of Philip's breaches of the law and customs of the land.

Scotland, in the course of her revolution, produced almost as brilliant an array of pamphleteers as had France. John Knox maintained that, "If men, in the fear of God, oppose themselves to the fury and blind rage of princes, in doing so they do not resist God, but the devil, who abuses the sword and authority of God," and again, he asked, "What harm should the commonwealth receive if the corrupt affections of ignorant rulers were moderated and bridled by the wisdom and discretion of godly subjects?" But the duty, he thought, to curb princes in free kingdoms and realms, does not belong to every private man, but "appertains to the nobility, sword and born counsellors of the same." Carrying such doctrines to the logical result, Knox hinted to Mary that Daniel might have resisted Nebuchadnezzar and Paul might have resisted Nero with the sword, had God given them the power.

Another Scotch Protestant, John Craig, in support of the prosecution of Mary, said that it had been determined and concluded at the University of Bologna that "all rulers, be they supreme or inferior, may be and ought to be reformed or deposed by them by whom they were chosen, confirmed and admitted to their office, as often as they break the promise made by oath to their subjects." Knox and Craig both argued for the execution of Mary on the ground that "it was a public speech among all peoples and among

estates, that the queen had no more liberty to commit murder nor adultery than any other private person." Knollys also told Mary that a monarch ought to be deposed for madness or murder.

To the zeal for religion animating Knox, George Buchanan joined a more rational spirit of liberty and a stronger consciousness of positive right. His great work *On the Constitution of Scotland* derived all power from the people, asserted the responsibility of kings to their subjects and pleaded for the popular election of the chief magistrate. In extreme cases execution of the monarch was defended, though by what precise machinery he was to be arraigned was left uncertain; probably constitutional resistance was thought of, as far as practicable, and tyrannicide was considered as a last resort. "If you ask anyone," says our author, "what he thinks of the punishment of Caligula, Nero or Domitian, I think no one will be so devoted to the royal name as not to confess that they rightly paid the penalty of their crimes."

In England the two tendencies, the one to favor the divine right of kings, the other for constitutional restraint, existed side by side. The latter opinion was attributed by courtly divines to the influence of Calvin. Matthew Hutton blamed the Reformer because "he thought not so well of a kingdom as of a popular state." "God save us," wrote Archbishop Parker, "from such a visitation as Knox has attempted in Scotland, the people to be orderers of things." This distinguished prelate preached that disobedience to the queen was a greater crime than sacrilege or adultery, for obedience is the root of all virtues and the cause of all felicity, and "rebellion is not a single fault, like theft or murder, but the cesspool and swamp of all possible sins against God and man." Bonner was charged by the government of Mary to preach that all rebels incurred damnation. Much later Richard Hooker warned his countrymen that Puritanism endangered the prerogatives of crown and nobility.

But there were not wanting champions of the people. Reginald Pole asserted the responsibility of the sovereign, though in moderate language. Bishop John Ponet wrote *A Treatise on Politic Power* to show that men had the right to depose a

bad king and to assassinate a tyrant. The haughty Elizabeth herself often had to listen to drastic advice. When she visited Cambridge she was entertained by a debate on tyrannicide, in which one bold clerk asserted that God might incite a regicide; and by a discussion of the respective advantages of elective and hereditary monarchy, one speaker offering to maintain the former with his life and, if need be, with his death. When Elizabeth, after hearing a refractory Parliament, complained to the Spanish ambassador that "she could not tell what those devils were after" his excellency replied, "They want liberty, madam, and if princes do not look to themselves" they will soon find that they are drifting to revolution and anarchy. Significant, indeed, was the silent work of Parliament in building up the constitutional doctrine of its own omnicompetence and of its own supremacy.

One striking aberration in the political theory of that time was the prominence in it of the appeal to tyrannicide. Schooled by the ancients who sang the praises of Harmodius and Aristogiton, by the biblical example of Ehud and Eglon, and by various medieval publicists, and taught the value of murder by the princes and popes who set prices on each other's heads, an extraordinary number of sixteenth century divines approved of the dagger as the best remedy for tyranny. Melancthon wished that God would raise up an able man to slay Henry VIII; John Ponet and Cajetan and the French theologian Boucher admitted the possible virtue of assassination. But the most elaborate statement of the same doctrine was put by the Spanish Jesuit Mariana, in a book *On the King and his Education*, published in 1599, with an official *imprimatur*, a dedication to the reigning monarch and an assertion that it was approved by learned and grave men of the Society of Jesus. It taught that the prince holds sway solely by the consent of the people and by ancient law, and that, though his vices are to be borne up to a certain point, yet when he ruins the state he is a public enemy, to slay whom is not only permissible but glorious for any man brave enough to despise his own safety for the public good.

If one may gather the official theory of the Catholic church from the contradictory statements of her doctors, she advo-



cated despotism tempered by assassination. No Lutheran ever preached the duty of passive obedience more strongly than did the Catechism of the Council of Trent.

A word must be said about the more radical thought of the time. All the writers just analysed saw things from the standpoint of the governing and propertied classes. But the voice of the poor came to be heard now and then, not only from their own mouths but from that of the few authors who had enough imagination to sympathize with them. The idea that men might sometime live without any government at all is found in such widely different writers as Richard Hooker and Francis Rabelais. But socialism was then, as ever, more commonly advocated than anarchy. The Anabaptists, particularly, believed in a community of goods, and even tried to practice it when they got the chance. Though they failed in this, the contributions to democracy latent in their egalitarian spirit must not be forgotten. They brought down on themselves the severest animadversions from defenders of the existing order, by whatever confession they were bound. Vives wrote a special tract to refute the arguments of the Anabaptists on communism. Luther said that the example of the early Christians did not authorize communism for, though the first disciples pooled their own goods, they did not try to seize the property of Pilate and Herod. Even the French Calvinists, in their books dedicated to liberty, referred to the Anabaptists as seditious rebels worthy of the severest repression.

A nobler work than any produced by the Anabaptists, and one that may have influenced them not a little, was the *Utopia* of Sir Thomas More. He drew partly on Plato, on Tacitus's *Germania*, on Augustine and on Pico della Mirandola, and for the outward framework of his book on the *Four Voyages of Americus Vespuccius*. But he relied mostly on his own observation of what was rotten in the English state where he was a judge and a ruler of men. He imagined an ideal country, Utopia, a place of perfect equality economically as well as politically. It was by government an elective monarchy with inferior magistrates and representative assembly also elected. The people changed houses every

ten years by lot; they considered luxury and wealth a reproach. "In other places they speak still of the common wealth but every man procureth his private wealth. Here where nothing is private the common affairs be earnestly looked upon." "What justice is this, that a rich goldsmith or usurer should have a pleasant and wealthy living either by idleness or by unnecessary occupation, when in the meantime poor laborers, carters, ironsmiths, carpenters and plowmen by so great and continual toil . . . do yet get so hard and so poor a living and live so wretched a life that the condition of the laboring beasts may seem much better and wealthier?" "When I consider and weigh in my mind all these commonwealths which nowadays anywhere do flourish, so God help me, I can perceive nothing but a certain conspiracy of rich men procuring their own commodities under the name and title of the commonwealth." More was convinced that a short day's labor shared by everyone would produce quite sufficient wealth to keep all in comfort. He protests explicitly against those who pretend that there are two sorts of justice, one for governments and one for private men. He repudiates the doctrine that bad faith is necessary to the prosperity of a state; the Utopians form no alliances and carry out faithfully the few and necessary treaties that they ratify. Moreover they dishonor war above all things.

In the realm of pure economic and social theory something, though not much, was done. Machiavelli believed that the growth of population in the north and its migration southwards was a constant law, an idea derived from Paulus Diaconus and handed on to Milton. He even derived "Germany" from "germinare." A more acute remark, anticipating Malthus, was made by the Spanish Jesuit John Botero who, in his *Reason of State*, pointed out that population was absolutely dependent on means of subsistence. He concluded *a priori* that the population of the world had remained stationary for three thousand years.

Statesmen then labored under the vicious error, drawn from the analogy of a private man and a state, that national wealth consisted in the precious metals. The stringent and universal laws against the export of specie and intended to

encourage its import, proved a considerable burden on trade, though as a matter of fact they only retarded and did not stop the flow of coin. The striking rise in prices during the century attracted some attention. Various causes were assigned for it, among others the growth of population and the increase of luxury. Hardly anyone saw that the increase in the precious metals was the fundamental cause, but several writers, among them Bodin, John Hales and Copernicus, saw that a debased currency was responsible for the acute dearth of certain local markets.

The lawfulness of the taking of usury greatly exercised the minds of men of that day. The church on traditional grounds had forbidden it, and her doctors stood fast by her precept, though an occasional individual, like John Eck, could be found to argue for it. Luther was in principle against allowing a man "to sit behind his stove and let his money work for him," but he weakened enough to allow moderate interest in given circumstances. Zwingli would allow interest to be taken only as a form of profit-sharing. Calvin said: "If we forbid usury wholly we bind consciences by a bond straiter than that of God himself. But if we allow it the least in the world, under cover of our permission someone will immediately make a general and unbridled licence." The laws against the taking of interest were gradually relaxed throughout the century, but even at its close Bacon could only regard usury as a concession made on account of the hardness of men's hearts.

#### § 4. Science

The glory of sixteenth-century science is that for the first time, on a large scale, since the ancient Greeks, did men try to look at nature through their own eyes instead of through those of Aristotle and the *Physiologus*. Bacon and Vives have each been credited with the discovery of the inductive method, but, like so many philosophers, they merely generalized a practice already common at their time. Save for one discovery of the first magnitude, and two or three others of some little importance, the work of the sixteenth century was that of observing, describing and classifying facts. This was

no small service in itself, though it does not strike the imagination as do the great new theories.

In mathematics the preparatory work for the statement and solution of new problems consisted in the perfection of symbolism. As reasoning in general is dependent on words, as music is dependent on the mechanical invention of instruments, so mathematics cannot progress far save with a simple and adequate symbolism. The introduction of the Arabic as against the Roman numerals, and particularly the introduction of the zero in reckoning, for the first time, in the later Middle Ages, allowed men to perform conveniently the four fundamental processes. The use of the signs  $+$  and  $-$  for plus and minus (formerly written p. and m.), and of the sign  $=$  for equality and of  $\sqrt{\quad}$  for root, were additional conveniences. To this might be added the popularization of decimals by Simon Stevin in 1586, which he called "the art of calculating by whole numbers without fractions." How clumsy are all things at their birth is illustrated by his method of writing decimals by putting them as powers of one-tenth, with circles around the exponents; e.g., the number that we should write 237.578, he wrote  $237^0 5^1 7^2 8^3$ . He first declared for decimal systems of coinage, weights and measures.

Algebraic notation also improved vastly in the period. In a treatise of Lucas Pacioli we find cumbrous signs instead of letters, thus no. (numero) for the known quantity, co. (cosa) for the unknown quantity, ce. (censo) for the square, and cu. (cubo) for the cube of the unknown quantity. As he still used p. and m. for plus and minus, he wrote 3co.p. 4ce.m.5cu.p.2ce.ce.m.6no. for the number we should write  $3x + 4x^2 - 5x^3 + 2x^4 - 6a$ . The use of letters in the modern style is due to the mathematicians of the sixteenth century. The solution of cubic and of biquadratic equations, at first only in certain particular forms, but later in all forms, was mastered by Tartaglia and Cardan. The latter even discussed negative roots, whether rational or irrational.

Geometry at that time, as for long afterwards, was dependent wholly on Euclid, of whose work a Latin translation was first published at Venice. Copernicus with his pupil George Joachim, called Rheticus, and Francis Vieta, made

some progress in trigonometry. Copernicus gave the first simple demonstration of the fundamental formula of spherical trigonometry; Rheticus made tables of sines, tangents and secants of arcs. Vieta discovered the formula for deriving the sine of a multiple angle.

As one turns the pages of the numerous works of Jerome Cardan one is astonished to find the number of subjects on which he wrote, including, in mathematics, choice and chance, arithmetic, algebra, the calendar, negative quantities, and the theory of numbers. In the last named branch it was another Italian, Maurolycus, who recognized the general character of mathematics as "symbolic logic." He is indeed credited with understanding the most general principle on which depends all mathematical deduction.<sup>3</sup> Some of the most remarkable anticipations of modern science were made by Cardan. He believed that inorganic matter was animated, and that all nature was a progressive evolution. Thus his statement that all animals were originally worms implies the indefinite variability of species, just as his remark that inferior metals were unsuccessful attempts of nature to produce gold, might seem to foreshadow the idea of the transmutation of metals under the influence of radioactivity. It must be remembered that such guesses had no claim to be scientific demonstrations.

The encyclopaedic character of knowledge was then, perhaps, one of its most striking characteristics. Bacon was not the first man of his century to take all knowledge for his province. In learning and breadth of view few men have ever exceeded Conrad Gesner, called by Cuvier "the German Pliny." His *History of Animals* (published in many volumes 1551-87) was the basis of zoölogy until the time of Darwin. He drew largely on previous writers, Aristotle and Albertus Magnus, but he also took pains to see for himself as much as possible. The excellent illustrations for his book, partly drawn from previous works but mostly new, added greatly to its value. His classification, though superior to any

<sup>3</sup> I.e., the principle thus formulated in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, s.v. "Mathematics": "If  $s$  is any class and zero a member of it, also if when  $x$  is a cardinal number and a member of  $s$ , also  $x + 1$  is a member of  $s$ , then the whole class of cardinal numbers is contained in  $s$ ."



that had preceded it, was in some respects astonishing, as when he put the hippopotamus among aquatic animals with fish, and the bat among birds. Occasionally he describes a purely mythical animal like "the monkey-fox." It is difficult to see what criterion of truth would have been adequate for the scholar at that time. A monkey-fox is no more improbable than a rhinoceros, and Gesner found it necessary to assure his readers that the rhinoceros really existed in nature and was not a creation of fancy.

As the master of modern anatomy and of several other branches of science, stands Leonardo da Vinci. It is difficult to appraise his work accurately because it is not yet fully known, and still more because of its extraordinary form. He left thousands of pages of notes on everything and hardly one complete treatise on anything. He began a hundred studies and finished none of them. He had a queer twist to his mind that made him, with all his power, seek byways. The monstrous, the uncouth, fascinated him; he saw a Medusa in a spider and the universe in a drop of water. He wrote his notes in mirror-writing, from right to left; he illustrated them with a thousand fragments of exquisite drawing, all unfinished and tantalizing alike to the artist and to the scientist. His mind roamed to flying machines and submarines, but he never made one; the reason given by him in the latter case being his fear that it would be put to piratical use. He had something in him of Faust; in some respects he reminds us of William James, who also started as a painter and ended as an omniverous student of outré things and as a psychologist.

If, therefore, the anatomical drawings made by Leonardo from about twenty bodies that he dissected, are marvellous specimens of art, he left it to others to make a really systematic study of the human body. His contemporary, Berengar of Carpi, professor at Bologna, first did this with marked success, classifying the various tissues as fat, membrane, flesh, nerve, fibre and so forth. So far from true is it that it was difficult to get corpses to work upon that he had at least a hundred. Indeed, according to Fallopius, another famous scientist, the Duke of Tuscany would occasionally send live

criminals to be vivisected, thus making their punishment redound to the benefit of science. The Inquisitors made the path of science hard by burning books on anatomy as materialistic and indecent.

Two or three investigators anticipated Harvey's discovery of the circulation of the blood. Unfortunately, as the matter is of interest, Servetus's treatment of the subject, found in his work on *The Trinity*, is too long to quote, but it is plain that, along with various fallacious ideas, he had really discovered the truth that the blood all passes through heart and lungs whence it is returned to the other organs.

While hardly anything was done in chemistry, a large number of phenomena in the field of physics were observed now for the first time. Leonardo da Vinci measured the rapidity of falling bodies, by dropping them from towers and having the time of their passage at various stages noted. He thus found, correctly, that their velocity increased. It is also said that he observed that bodies always fell a little to the eastward of the plumb line, and thence concluded that the earth revolved on its axis. He made careful experiments with billiard balls, discovering that the momentum of the impact always was preserved entire in the motion of the balls struck. He measured forces by the weight and speed of the bodies and arrived at an approximation of the ideas of mechanical "work" and energy of position. He thought of energy as a spiritual force transferred from one body to another by touch. This remarkable man further invented a hygrometer, explained sound as a wave-motion in the air, and said that the appearance known to us as "the old moon in the new moon's lap" was due to the reflection of earth-light.

Nicholas Tartaglia first showed that the course of a projectile was a parabola, and that the maximum range of a gun would be at an angle of  $45^\circ$ .

Some good work was done in optics. John Baptist della Porta described, though he did not invent, the camera obscura. Burning glasses were explained. Leonard Digges even anticipated the telescope by the use of double lenses.

Further progress in mechanics was made by Cardan who

explained the lever and pulley, and by Simon Stevin who first demonstrated the resolution of forces. He also noticed the difference between stable and unstable equilibrium, and showed that the downward pressure of a liquid is independent of the shape of the vessel it is in and is dependent only on the height. He and other scholars asserted the causation of the tides by the moon.

Magnetism was much studied. When compasses were first invented it was thought that they always pointed to the North Star under the influence of some stellar compulsion. But even in the fifteenth century it was noticed independently by Columbus and by German experimenters that the needle did not point true north. As the amount of its declination varies at different places on the earth and at different times, this was one of the most puzzling facts to explain. One man believed that the change depended on climate, another that it was an individual property of each needle. About 1581 Robert Norman discovered the inclination, or dip of the compass. These and other observations were summed up by William Gilbert in his work on *The Magnet, Magnetic Bodies and the Earth as a great Magnet*. A great deal of his space was taken in that valuable destructive criticism that refutes prevalent errors. His greatest discovery was that the earth itself is a large magnet. He thought of magnetism as "a soul, or like a soul, which is in many things superior to the human soul as long as this is bound by our bodily organs." It was therefore an appetite that compelled the magnet to point north and south. Similar explanations of physical and chemical properties are found in the earliest and in some of the most recent philosophers.

As might be expected, the science of geography, nourished by the discoveries of new lands, grew mightily. Even the size of the earth could only be guessed at until it had been encircled. Columbus believed that its circumference at the equator was 8000 miles. The stories of its size that circulated after Magellan were exaggerated by the people. Thus Sir David Lyndsay in his poem *The Dreme* quotes "the author of the sphere" as saying that the earth was 101,750 miles in circumference, each mile being 5000 feet. The author re-

ferred to was the thirteenth century Johannes de Sacro Bosco (John Holywood). Two editions of his work, *De Sphaera*, that I have seen, one of Venice, 1499, and one of Paris, 1527, give the circumference of the earth as 20,428 miles, but an edition published at Wittenberg in 1550 gives it as 25,400, probably an attempt to reduce the author's English miles to German ones. Robert Recorde calculated the earth's circumference at 21,300 miles.\*

Rough maps of the new lands were drawn by the companions of the discoverers. Martin Waldseemüller published a large map of the world in twelve sheets and a small globe about 4½ inches in diameter, in which the new world is for the first time called America. The next great advance was made by the Flemish cartographer Gerard Mercator whose globes and maps—some of them on the projection since called by his name—are extraordinarily accurate for Europe and the coast of Africa, and fairly correct for Asia, though he represented that continent as too narrow. He included, however, in their approximately correct positions, India, the Malay peninsula, Sumatra, Java and Japan. America is very poorly drawn, for though the east coast of North America is fairly correct, the continent is too broad and the rest of the coasts vague. He made two startling anticipations of later discoveries, the first that he separated Asia and America by only a narrow strait at the north, and the second that he assumed the existence of a continent around the south pole. This, however, he made far too large, thinking that the Tierra del Fuego was part of it and drawing it so as to come near the south coast of Africa and of Java. His maps of Europe were based on recent and excellent surveys.

Astronomy, the oldest of the sciences, had made much progress in the tabulation of material. The apparent orbits of the sun, moon, planets, and stars had been correctly observed, so that eclipses might be predicted, conjunction of planets calculated, and that gradual movement of the sun through the signs of the zodiac known as the precession of

Eratosthenes (276–196 B. C.) had correctly calculated the earth's circumference at 25,000, which Peseidonius (c. 135–50 B. C.) reduced to 18,000, in which he was followed by Ptolemy (2nd century A. D.).

the equinoxes, taken account of. To explain these movements the ancients started on the theory that each heavenly body moved in a perfect circle around the earth; the fixed stars were assigned to one of a group of revolving spheres, the sun, moon and five planets each to one, making eight in all. But it was soon observed that the movements of the planets were too complicated to fall into this system; the number of moving spheres was raised to 27 before Aristotle and to 56 by him. To these concentric spheres later astronomers added eccentric spheres, moving within others, called epicycles, and to them epicycles of the second order; in fact astronomers were compelled:

To build, unbuild, contrive,  
To save appearances, to gird the sphere  
With centric and eccentric scribbled o'er  
Cycle and epicycle, orb in orb.

The complexity of this system, which moved the mirth of Voltaire and, according to Milton, of the Almighty, was such as to make it doubted by some thinkers even in antiquity. Several men thought the earth revolved on its axis, but the hypothesis was rejected by Aristotle and Ptolemy. Heracleides, in the fourth century B. C., said that Mercury and Venus circled around the sun, and in the third century Aristarchus of Samos actually anticipated, though it was a mere guess, the heliocentric theory.

Just before Copernicus various authors seemed to hint at the truth, but in so mystical or brief a way that little can be made of their statements. Thus, Nicholas of Cusa argued that "as the earth cannot be the center of the universe it cannot lack all motion." Leonardo believed that the earth revolved on its axis, and stated that it was a star and would look, to a man on the moon, as the moon does to us. In one place he wrote, "the sun does not move,"—only that enigmatical sentence and nothing more.

Nicholas Copernicus was a native of Thorn in Poland, himself of mixed Polish and Teutonic blood. At the age of eighteen he went to the university of Cracow, where he spent



three years. In 1496 he was enabled by an ecclesiastical appointment to go to Italy, where he spent most of the next ten years in study. He worked at the universities of Bologna, Padua and Ferrara, and lectured—though not as a member of the university—at Rome. His studies were comprehensive, including civil law, canon law, medicine, mathematics, and the classics. At Padua, on May 31, 1503, he was made doctor of canon law. He also studied astronomy in Italy, talked with the most famous professors of that science and made observations of the heavens.

Copernicus's uncle was bishop of Ermeland, a spiritual domain and fief of the Teutonic Order, under the supreme suzerainty, at least after 1525, of the king of Poland. Here Copernicus spent the rest of his life; the years 1506-1512 in the bishop's palace at Heilsberg, after 1512, except for two not long stays at Allenstein, as a canon at Frauenburg.

This little town, near but not quite on the Baltic coast, is ornamented by a beautiful cathedral. On the wall surrounding the close is a small tower which the astronomer made his observatory. Here, in the long frosty nights of winter and in the few short hours of summer darkness, he often lay on his back examining the stars. He had no telescope, and his other instruments were such crude things as he put together himself. The most important was what he calls the *Instrumentum parallacticum*, a wooden isosceles triangle with legs eight feet long divided into 1000 divisions by ink marks, and a hypotenuse divided into 1414 divisions. With this he determined the height of the sun, moon and stars, and their deviation from the vernal point. To this he added a square (quadrum) which told the height of the sun by the shadow thrown by a peg in the middle of the square. A third instrument, also to measure the height of a celestial body, was called the Jacob's staff. His difficulties were increased by the lack of any astronomical tables save those poor ones made by Greeks and Arabs. The faults of these were so great that the fundamental star, *i.e.*, the one he took by which to measure the rest, Spica, was given a longitude nearly 40' out of the true one.

Nevertheless with these poor helps Copernicus arrived,

and that very early, at his momentous conclusion. His observations, depending as they did on the weather, were not numerous. His time was spent largely in reading the classic astronomers and in working out the mathematical proofs of his hypothesis. He found hints in quotations from ancient astronomers in Cicero and Plutarch that the earth moved, but he, for the first time, placed the planets in their true position around the sun, and the moon as a satellite of the earth. He retained the old conception of the *primum mobile* or sphere of fixed stars though he placed it at an infinitely greater distance than did the ancients, to account for the absence of any observed alteration (parallax) in the position of the stars during the year. He also retained the old conception of circular orbits for the planets, though at one time he considered the possibility of their being elliptical, as they are. Unfortunately for his immediate followers the section on this subject found in his own manuscript was cut out of his printed book.

The precise moment at which Copernicus formulated his theory in his own mind cannot be told with certainty, but it was certainly before 1516. He kept back his books for a long time, but his light was not placed under a bushel nevertheless. The first rays of it shown forth in a tract by Celio Calcagnini of which only the title, "That the earth moves and the heaven is still," has survived. Some years later Copernicus wrote a short summary of his book, for private circulation only, entitled "A Short commentary on his hypotheses concerning the celestial movements." A fuller account of them was given by his friend and disciple, George Joachim, called Rheticus, who left Wittenberg, where he was teaching, to sit at the master's feet, and who published what was called *The First Account*.

Finally, Copernicus was persuaded to give his own work to the public. Foreseeing the opposition it was likely to call forth, he tried to forestall criticism by a dedication to the Pope Paul III. Friends at Nuremberg undertook to find a printer, and one of them, the Lutheran pastor Andrew Osiander, with the best intentions, did the great wrong of inserting an anonymous preface stating that the author did

not advance his hypotheses as necessarily true, but merely as a means of facilitating astronomical calculations. At last the greatest work of the century, *On the Revolutions of the Heavenly Spheres*, came from the press; a copy was brought to the author on his death bed.

The first of the six books examines the previous authorities, the second proposes the new theory, the third discusses the precession of the equinoxes, the fourth proves that the moon circles the earth, the fifth and most important proves that the planets, including the earth, move around the sun, and gives correctly the time of the orbits of all the planets then known, from Mercury with eighty-eight days to Saturn with thirty years. The sixth book is on the determination of latitude and longitude from the fixed stars. Copernicus's proofs and reasons are absolutely convincing and valid as far as they go. It remained for Galileo and Newton to give further explanations and some modifications in detail of the new theory.

When one remembers the enormous hubbub raised by Darwin's *Origin of Species*, the reception of Copernicus's no less revolutionary work seems singularly mild. The idea was too far in advance of the age, too great, too paradoxical, to be appreciated at once. Save for a few astronomers like Rheticus and Reinhold, hardly anyone accepted it at first. It would have been miraculous had they done so.

Among the first to take alarm were the Wittenberg theologians, to whose attention the new theory was forcibly brought by their colleague Rheticus. Luther alludes to the subject twice or thrice in his table talk, most clearly on June 4, 1539, when

mention was made of a certain new astronomer, who tried to prove that the earth moved and not the sky, sun and moon, just as, when one was carried along in a boat or wagon, it seemed to himself that he was still and that the trees and landscape moved. "So it goes now," said Luther, "whoever wishes to be clever must not let anything please him that others do, but must do something of his own. Thus he does who wishes to subvert the

whole of astronomy; but I believe the Holy Scriptures, which say that Joshua commanded the sun, and not the earth, to stand still.

In his *Elements of Physics*, written probably in 1545, but not published until 1549, Melanchthon said:

The eyes bear witness that the sky revolves every twenty-four hours. But some men now, either for love of novelty, or to display their ingenuity, assert that the earth moves. . . . But it is hurtful and dishonorable to assert such absurdities. . . . The Psalmist says that the sun moves and the earth stands fast. . . . And the earth, as the center of the universe, must needs be the immovable point on which the circle turns.

Apparently, however, Melanchthon either came to adopt the new theory, or to regard it as possible, for he left this passage entirely out of the second edition of the same work. Moreover his relations with Rheticus continued warm, and Rheinholt continued to teach the Copernican system at Wittenberg.

The reception of the new work was also surprisingly mild, at first, in Catholic circles. As early as 1533 Albert Widmanstetter had told Clement VII of the Copernican hypothesis and the pope did not, at least, condemn it. Moreover it was a cardinal, Schönberg, who consulted Paul III on the matter and then urged Copernicus to publish his book, though in his letter the language is so cautiously guarded against possible heresy that not a word is said about the earth moving around the sun but only about the moon and the bodies near it so doing. A Spanish theologian, Didacus a Stunica (Zuñiga) wrote a commentary on Job, which was licensed by the censors, accepting the Copernican astronomy.

But gradually, as the implications of the doctrine became apparent, the church in self-defence took a strong stand against it. The Congregation of the Index issued a decree saying, "Lest opinions of this sort creep in to the destruction of Catholic truth, the book of Nicholas Copernicus and others [defending his hypothesis] are suspended until they

be corrected." A little later Galileo was forced, under the threat of torture, to recant this heresy. Only when the system had become universally accepted, did the church, in 1822, first expressly permit the faithful to hold it.

The philosophers were as shy of the new light as the theologians. Bodin in France and Bacon in England both rejected it; the former was conservative at heart and the latter was never able to see good in other men's work, whether that of Aristotle or of Gilbert or of the great Pole. Possibly he was also misled by Osiander's preface and by Tycho Brahe. Giordano Bruno, however, welcomed the new idea with enthusiasm, saying that Copernicus taught more in two chapters than did Aristotle and the Peripatetics in all their works.

Astronomers alone were capable of weighing the evidence scientifically and they, at first, were also divided. Erasmus Reinhold, of Wittenberg, accepted it and made his calculations on the assumption of its truth, as did an Englishman, John Field. Tycho Brahe, on the other hand, tried to find a compromise between the Copernican and Ptolemaic systems. He argued that the earth could not revolve on its axis as the centrifugal force would hurl it to pieces, and that it could not revolve around the sun as in that case a change in the position of the fixed stars would be observed. Both objections were well taken, of course, considered in themselves alone, but both could be answered by a deeper knowledge. Brahe therefore considered the earth as the center of the orbits of the moon, sun, and stars, and the sun as the center of the orbits of the planets.

The attention to astronomy had two practical corollaries, the improvement of navigation and the reform of the calendar. Several better forms of astrolabe, of "sun-compass" (or dial turnable by a magnet) and an "astronomical ring" for getting the latitude and longitude by observation of sun and star, were introduced.

The reform of the Julian calendar was needed on account of the imperfect reckoning of the length of the year as exactly  $365\frac{1}{4}$  days; thus every four centuries there would be three days too much. It was proposed to remedy this for



the present by leaving out ten days, and for the future by omitting leap-year every century not divisible by 400. The bull of Gregory XIII, who resumed the duties of the ancient Pontifex Maximus in regulating time, enjoined Catholic lands to rectify their calendar by allowing the fifteenth of October, 1582, to follow immediately after the fourth. This was done by most of Italy, by Spain, Portugal, Poland, most of Germany, and the Netherlands. Other lands adopted the new calendar later, England not until 1752 and Russia not until 1917.

## § 5. Philosophy

The interrelations of science, religion, and philosophy, though complex in their operation, are easily understood in their broad outlines. Science is the examination of the data of experience and their explanation in logical, physical, or mathematical terms. Religion, on the other hand, is an attitude towards unseen powers, involving the belief in the existence of spirits. Philosophy, or the search for the ultimate reality, is necessarily an afterthought. It comes only after man is sophisticated enough to see some difference between the phenomenon and the idea. It draws its premises from both science and religion: some systems, like that of Plato, being primarily religious fancy, some, like that of Aristotle, scientific realism.

The philosophical position taken by the Catholic church was that of Aquinas, Aristotelian realism. The official commentary on the *Summa* was written at this time by Cardinal Cajetan. Compared to the steady orientation of the Catholic, the Protestant philosophers wavered, catching often at the latest style in thought, be it monism or pragmatism. Luther was the spiritual child of Occam, and the ancestor of Kant. His individualism stood half-way between the former's nominalism and the latter's transcendentalism and subjectivism. But the Reformers were far less interested in purely metaphysical than they were in dogmatic questions. The main use they made of their philosophy was to bring in a more individual and less mechanical scheme of salvation. Their great change in point of view from Catholicism was the re-

jection of the sacramental, hierarchical system in favor of justification by faith. This was, in truth, a stupendous change, putting the responsibility for salvation directly on God, and dispensing with the mediation of priest and rite.

But it was the only important change, of a speculative nature, made by the Reformers. The violent polemics of that and later times have concealed the fact that in most of his ideas the Protestant is but a variety of the Catholic. Both religions accepted as axiomatic the existence of a personal, ethical God, the immortality of the soul, future rewards and punishments, the mystery of the Trinity, the revelation, incarnation and miracles of Christ, the authority of the Bible and the real presence in the sacrament. Both equally detested reason.

He who is gifted with the heavenly knowledge of faith [says the Catechism of the Council of Trent] is free from an inquisitive curiosity; for when God commands us to believe, he does not propose to have us search into his divine judgments, nor to inquire their reasons and causes, but demands an immutable faith. . . . Faith, therefore, excludes not only all doubt, but even the desire of subjecting its truth to demonstration.

We know that reason is the devil's harlot [says Luther] and can do nothing but slander and harm all that God says and does. [And again] If, outside of Christ, you wish by your own thoughts to know your relation to God, you will break your neck. Thunder strikes him who examines. It is Satan's wisdom to tell what God is, and by doing so he will draw you into the abyss. Therefore keep to revelation and don't try to understand.

There are many mysteries in the Bible, Luther acknowledged, that seem absurd to reason, but it is our duty to swallow them whole. Calvin abhorred the free spirit of the humanists as the supreme heresy of free thought. He said that philosophy was only the shadow and revelation the substance. "Nor is it reasonable," said he, "that the divine will should be made the subject of controversy with us."

Zwingli, anticipating Descartes's "finitum infiniti capax non est," stated that our small minds could not grasp God's plan. Oecolampadius, dying, said that he wanted no more light than he then had—an instructive contrast to Goethe's last words: "Mehr Licht!" Even Bacon, either from prudence or conviction, said that theological mysteries seeming absurd to reason must be believed.

Nor were the radical sects a whit more rational. Those who represented the protest against Protestantism and the dissidence of dissent appealed to the Bible as an authority and abhorred reason as much as did the orthodox churches. The Antitrinitarians were no more deists or free thinkers than were the Lutherans. Campanus and Adam Pastor and Servetus and the Sozinis had no aversion to the supernatural and made no claim to reduce Christianity to a humanitarian deism, as some modern Unitarians would do. Their doubts were simply based on a different exegesis of the biblical texts. Fausto Sozini thought Christ was "a subaltern God to whom at a certain time the Supreme God gave over the government of the world." Servetus defined the Trinity to be "not an illusion of three invisible things, but the manifestation of God in the Word and a communication of the substance of God in the Spirit." This is no new rationalism coming in but a reversion to an obsolete heresy, that of Paul of Samosata. It does not surprise us to find Servetus lecturing on astrology.

Somewhat to the left of the Antitrinitarian sects were a few men, who had hardly any followers, who may be called, for want of a better term, Spiritual Reformers. They sought, quite in the nineteenth century spirit, to make Christianity nothing but an ethical culture. James Acontius, born in Trent but naturalized in England, published his *Stratagems of Satan* in 1565 to reduce the fundamental doctrines of Christianity to the very fewest possible. Sebastian Franck of Ingolstadt found the only authority for each man in his inward, spiritual message. He sought to found no community or church, but to get only readers. These men passed almost unnoticed in their day.

There was much skepticism throughout the century. Com-

plete Pyrrhonism under a thin veil of lip-conformity, was preached by Peter Pomponazzi, professor of philosophy at Padua, Ferrara and Bologna. His *De immortalitate animi* caused a storm by its plain conclusion that the soul perished with the body. He tried to make the distinction in his favor that a thing might be true in religion and false in philosophy. Thus he denied his belief in demons and spirits as a philosopher, while affirming that he believed in them as a Christian. He was in fact a materialist. He placed Christianity, Mohammedanism and Judaism on the same level, broadly hinting that all were impostures.

Public opinion became so interested in the subject of immortality at this time that when another philosopher, Simon Porzio, tried to lecture on meteorology at Pisa, his audience interrupted him with cries, "Quid de anima?" He, also, maintained that the soul of man was like that of the beasts. But he had few followers who dared to express such an opinion. After the Inquisition had shown its teeth, the life of the Italian nation was like that of its great poet, Tasso, whose youth was spent at the feet of the Jesuits and whose manhood was haunted by fears of having unwittingly done something that might be punished by the stake. It was to counteract the pagan opinion, stated to be rapidly growing, that the Vatican Council forbade all clerics to lecture on the classics for five years. But in vain! A report of Paul III's cardinals charged professors of philosophy with teaching impiety. Indeed, the whole literature of contemporary Italy, from Machiavelli, who treated Christianity as a false and noxious superstition, to Pulci who professed belief in nothing but pleasure, is saturated with free thought. "Vanity makes most humanists skeptics," wrote Ariosto, "why is it that learning and infidelity go hand in hand?"

In Germany, too, there was some free thought, the most celebrated case being that of the "godless painters of Nuremberg," Hans Sebald Beham, Bartholomew Beham, and George Penz. The first named expressed some doubts about various Protestant doctrines. Bartholomew went further, asserting that baptism was a human device, that the Scriptures could not be believed and that the preaching he had heard

was but idle talk, producing no fruit in the life of the preacher himself; he recognized no superior authority but that of God. George Penz went further still, for while he admitted the existence of God he asserted that his nature was unknowable, and that he could believe neither in Christ nor in the Scriptures nor in the sacraments. The men were banished from the city.

✓ In France, as in Italy, the opening of the century saw signs of increasing skepticism in the frequent trials of heretics who denied all Christian doctrines and "all principles save natural ones." But a spirit far more dangerous to religion than any mere denial incarnated itself in Rabelais. He did not philosophize, but he poured forth a torrent of the raw material from which philosophies are made. He did not argue or attack; he rose like a flood or a tide until men found themselves either swimming in the sea of mirth and mockery, or else swept off their feet by it. He studied law, theology and medicine; he travelled in Germany and Italy and he read the classics, the schoolmen, the humanists and the heretics. And he found everywhere that nature and life were good and nothing evil in the world save its deniers. To live according to nature he built, in his story, the abbey of Thélème, a sort of hedonist's or anarchist's Utopia where men and women dwell together under the rule, "Do what thou wilt," and which has over its gates the punning invitation: "Cy entrez, vous, qui le saint evangile en sens agile annoncez, quoy qu'on gronde." For Rabelais there was nothing sacred, or even serious in "revealed religion," and God was "that intellectual sphere the center of which is every where and the circumference nowhere."

Rabelais was not the only Frenchman to burlesque the religious quarrels of the day. Bonaventure des Périers, in a work called *Cymbalum Mundi*, introduced Luther under the anagram of Rethulus, a Catholic as Tryocan (*i.e.*, Croyant) and a skeptic as Du Clénier (*i.e.*, Incrédule), debating their opinions in a way that redounded much to the advantage of the last named.

Then there was Stephen Dolet the humanist publisher of Lyons, burned to death as an atheist, because, in translating



the Axiochos, a dialogue then attributed to Plato, he had written "After death you will be nothing at all" instead of "After death you will be no more," as the original is literally to be construed. The charge was frivolous, but the impression was doubtless correct that he was a rather indifferent skeptic, disdainful of religion. He, too, considered the Reformers only to reject them as too much like their enemies. No Christian church could hold the worshipper of Cicero and of letters, of glory and of humanity. And yet this sad and restless man, who found the taste of life as bitter as Rabelais had found it sweet, died for his faith. He was the martyr of the Renaissance.

A more systematic examination of religion was made by Jean Bodin in his *Colloquy on Secret and Sublime Matters*, commonly called the *Heptaplomeres*. Though not published until long after the author's death, it had a brisk circulation in manuscript and won a reputation for impiety far beyond its deserts. It is simply a conversation between a Jew, a Mohammedan, a Lutheran, a Zwinglian, a Catholic, an Epicurean and a Theist. The striking thing about it is the fairness with which all sides are presented; there is no summing up in favor of one faith rather than another. Nevertheless, the conclusion would force itself upon the reader that among so many religions there was little choice; that there was something true and something false in all; and that the only necessary articles were those on which all agreed. Bodin was half way between a theist and a deist; he believed that the Decalogue was a natural law imprinted in all men's hearts and that Judaism was the nearest to being a natural religion. He admitted, however, that the chain of causality was broken by miracle and he believed in witchcraft. It cannot be thought that he was wholly without personal faith, like Machiavelli, and yet his strong argument against changing religion even if the new be better than the old, is entirely worldly. With France before his eyes, it is not strange that he drew the general conclusion that any change of religion is dangerous and sure to be followed by war, pestilence, famine and demoniacal possession.

After the fiery stimulants, compounded of brimstone and |

Stygian hatred, offered by Calvin and the Catholics, and after the plethoric gorge of good cheer at Gargantua's table, the mild sedative of Montaigne's conversation comes like a draft of nepenthe or the fruit of the lotus. In him we find no blast and blaze of propaganda, no fulmination of bull and ban; nor any tide of earth-encircling Rabelaisian mirth. His words fall as softly and as thick as snowflakes, and they leave his world a white page, with all vestiges of previous writings erased. He neither asseverates nor denies; he merely, as he puts it himself, "juggles," treating of idle subjects which he believes nothing at all, for he has noticed that as soon one denies the possibility of anything, someone else will say that he has seen it. In short, truth is a near neighbor to falsehood, and the wise man can only repeat, "Que sais-je?" Let us live delicately and quietly, finding the world worth enjoying, but not worth troubling about.

Wide as are the differences between the Greek thinker and the French, there is something Socratic in the way in which Montaigne takes up every subject only to suggest doubts of previously held opinion about it. If he remained outwardly a Catholic, it was because he saw exactly as much to doubt in other religions. Almost all opinions, he urges, are taken on authority, for when men begin to reason they draw diametrically opposite conclusions from the same observed facts. He was in the civil wars esteemed an enemy by all parties, though it was only because he had both Huguenot and Catholic friends. "I have seen in Germany," he wrote, "that Luther hath left as many divisions and altercations concerning the doubt of his opinions, yea, and more, than he himself moveth about the Holy Scriptures." The Reformers, in fact, had done nothing but reform superficial faults and had either left the essential ones untouched, or increased them. How foolish they were to imagine that the people could understand the Bible if they could only read it in their own language!

Montaigne was the first to feel the full significance of the multiplicity of sects. "Is there any opinion so fantastical, or conceit so extravagant . . . or opinion so strange," he asked, "that custom hath not established and planted by laws

in some region?" Usage sanctions every monstrosity, including incest and parricide in some places, and in others "that unsociable opinion of the mortality of the soul." Indeed, Montaigne comes back to the point, a man's belief does not depend on his reason, but on where he was born and how brought up. "To an atheist all writings make for atheism." "We receive our religion but according to our fashion. . . . Another country, other testimonies, equal promises, like menaces, might seemably imprint a clean contrary religion in us."

Piously hoping that he has set down nothing repugnant to the prescriptions of the Catholic, Apostolic and Roman church, where he was born and out of which he purposes not to die, Montaigne proceeds to demonstrate that God is unknowable. A man cannot grasp more than his hand will hold nor straddle more than his legs' length. Not only all religions, but all scientists give the lie to each other. Copernicus, having recently overthrown the old astronomy, may be later overthrown himself. In like manner the new medical science of Paracelsus contradicts the old and may in turn pass away. The same facts appear differently to different men, and "nothing comes to us but falsified and altered by our senses." Probability is as hard to get as truth, for a man's mind is changed by illness, or even by time, and by his wishes. Even skepticism is uncertain, for "when the Pyrrhonians say, 'I doubt,' you have them fast by the throat to make them avow that at least you are assured and know that they doubt." In short, "nothing is certain but uncertainty," and "nothing seemeth true that may not seem false." Montaigne wrote of pleasure as the chief end of man, and of death as annihilation. The glory of philosophy is to teach men to despise death. One should do so by remembering that it is as great folly to weep because one would not be alive a hundred years hence as it would be to weep because one had not been living a hundred years ago.

A disciple who dotted the i's and crossed the t's of Montaigne was Peter Charron. He, too, played off the contradictions of the sects against each other. All claim inspiration and who can tell which inspiration is right? Can the same

Spirit tell the Catholic that the books of Maccabees are canonical and tell Luther that they are not? The senses are fallible and the soul, located by Charron in a ventricle of the brain, is subject to strange disturbances. Many things almost universally believed, like immortality, cannot be proved. Man is like the lower animals. "We believe, judge, act, live and die on faith," but this faith is poorly supported, for all religions and all authorities are but of human origin.

English thought followed rather than led that of Europe throughout the century. At first tolerant and liberal, it became violently religious towards the middle of the period and then underwent a strong reaction in the direction of indifference and atheism. For the first years, before the Reformation, the *Utopia* may serve as an example. More, under the influence of the Italian Platonists, pictured his ideal people as adherents of a deistic, humanitarian religion, with few priests and holy, tolerant of everything save intolerance. They worshipped one God, believed in immortality and yet thought that "the chief felicity of man" lay in the pursuit of rational pleasure. Whether More depicted this cult simply to fulfil the dramatic probabilities and to show what was natural religion among men before revelation came to them, or whether his own opinions altered in later life, it is certain that he became robustly Catholic. He spent much time in religious controversy and resorted to austerities. In one place he tells of a lewd gallant who asked a friar why he gave himself the pain of walking barefoot. Answered that this pain was less than hell, the gallant replied, "If there be no hell, what a fool are you," and received the retort, "If there be hell, what a fool are you." Sir Thomas evidently believed there was a hell, or preferred to take no chances. In one place he argues at length that many and great miracles daily take place at shrines.

The feverish crisis of the Reformation was followed in the reign of Elizabeth by an epidemic of skepticism. Widely as it was spread there can be found little philosophical thought in it. It was simply the pendulum pulled far to the right swinging back again to the extreme left. The suspicions expressed that the queen herself was an atheist were un-

founded, but it is impossible to dismiss as easily the numerous testimonies of infidelity among her subjects. Roger Ascham wrote in his *Schoolmaster* that the "incarnate devils" of Englishmen returned from Italy said "there is no God" and then, "they first lustily condemn God, then scornfully mock his Word . . . counting as fables the holy mysteries of religion. They make Christ and his Gospel only serve civil policies. . . . They boldly laugh to scorn both Protestant and Papist. They confess no Scripture. . . . They mock the pope; they rail on Luther. . . . They are Epicures in living and *ἄθεοι* in doctrine."

In like manner Cecil wrote: "The service of God and the sincere profession of Christianity are much decayed, and in place of it, partly papistry, partly paganism and irreligion have crept in. . . . Baptists, deriders of religion, Epicureans and atheists are everywhere." Ten years later John Lyly wrote that "there never were such sects among the heathens, such schisms among the Turks, such misbelief among infidels as is now among scholars." The same author wrote a dialogue, *Euphues and Atheos*, to convince skeptics, while from the pulpit the Puritan Henry Smith shot "God's Arrow against atheists." According to Thomas Nash (*Pierce Penniless's Supplication to the Devil*) atheists are now triumphing and rejoicing, scorning the Bible, proving that there were men before Adam and even maintaining "that there are no divells." Marlowe and some of his associates were suspected of atheism. In 1595 John Baldwin, examined before Star Chamber, "questioned whether there were a God; if there were, how he should be known; if by his Word, who wrote the same, if the prophets and the apostles, they were but men and *humanum est errare*." The next year Robert Fisher maintained before the same court that "Christ was no saviour and that the gospel was a fable."

That one of the prime causes of all this skepticism was to be found in the religious revolution was the opinion of Francis Bacon. Although Bacon's philosophic thought is excluded from consideration by the chronological limits of this book, it may be permissible to quote his words on this subject. In one place he says that where there are two religions



contending for mastery their mutual animosity will add warmth to conviction and rather strengthen the adherents of each in their own opinions, but where there are more than two they will breed doubt. In another place he says:

Heresies and schisms are of all others the greatest scandals, yea more than corruption of manners. . . . So that nothing doth so keep men out of the church and drive men out of the church as breach of unity. . . . The doctor of the gentiles saith, "If an heathen come in and hear you speak with several tongues, will he not say that you are mad?" And certainly it is little better when atheists and profane persons hear of so many discordant and contrary opinions in religion.

But while Bacon saw that when doctors disagree the common man will lose all faith in them, it was not to religion but to science that he looked for the reformation of philosophy. Theology, in Bacon's judgment, was a chief enemy to philosophy, for it seduced men from scientific pursuit of truth to the service of dogma. "You may find all access to any species of philosophy," said Bacon, "however pure, intercepted by the ignorance of divines."

The thought here expressed but sums up the actual trend of the sixteenth century in the direction of separating philosophy and religion. In modern times the philosopher has found his inspiration far more in science than in religion, and the turning-point came about the time of, and largely as a consequence of, the new observation of nature, and particularly the new astronomy.

The prologue to the drama of the new thought was the revolt against Aristotle. "The master of them who know" had become, after the definite acceptance of his works as standard texts in the universities of the thirteenth century, an inspired and infallible authority for all science. With him were associated the schoolmen who debated the question of realism versus nominalism. But as the mind of man grew and advanced, what had been once the brace became a galling bond. All parties united to make common cause against the Stagyrte. The Italian Platonists attacked him

in the name of their, and his, master. Luther opined that no one had ever understood Aristotle's meaning, that the ethics of that "damned heathen" directly contradicted Christian virtue, that any potter would know more of natural science than he, and that it would be well if he who had started the debate on realism and nominalism had never been born. Catholics like Usingen protested at the excessive reverence given to Aristotle at the expense of Christ. Finally, the French scientist Peter Ramus advanced the thesis at the University of Paris that everything taught by Aristotle was false. No authority, he argued, is superior to reason, for it is reason which creates and determines authority.

In place of Aristotle men turned to nature. "Whosoever in discussion adduces authority uses not intellect but memory," said Leonardo. Vives urged that experiment was the only road to truth. The discoveries of natural laws led to a new conception of external reality, independent of man's wishes and egocentric theories. It also gave rise to the conception of uniformity of law. Copernicus sought and found a mathematical unity in the heavens. It was, above all else, his astronomy that fought the battle of, and won the victory for, the new principles of research. Its glory was not so much its positive addition to knowledge, great as that was, but its mode of thought. By pure reason a new system was established and triumphed over the testimony of the senses and of all previous authority, even that which purported to be revelation. Man was reduced to a creature of law; God was defined as an expression of law.

How much was man's imagination touched, how was his whole thought and purpose changed by the Copernican discovery! No longer lord of a little, bounded world, man crept as a parasite on a grain of dust spinning eternally through endless space. And with the humiliation came a great exaltation. For this tiny creature could now seal the stars and bind the Pleiades and sound each deep abyss that held a sun. What new sublimity of thought, what greatness of soul was not his! To Copernicus belongs properly the praise lavished by Lucretius on Epicurus, of having burst the flaming bounds of the world and of having made man equal to heaven. The history of the past, the religion of the present,

the science of the future—all ideas were transmuted, all values reversed by this new and wonderful hypothesis.

But all this, of course, was but dimly sensed by the contemporaries of Copernicus. What they really felt was the new compulsion of natural law and the necessity of causation. Leonardo was led thus far by his study of mathematics, which he regarded as the key to natural science. He even went so far as to define time as a sort of non-geometrical space.

Two things were necessary to a philosophy in harmony with the scientific view; the first was a new theory of knowledge, the second was a new conception of the ultimate reality in the universe. Paracelsus contributed to the first in the direction of modern empiricism, by defending understanding as that which comprehended exactly the thing that the hand touched and the eyes saw. Several immature attempts were made at scientific skepticism. That of Cornelius Agrippa—*De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum et artium atque excellentia Verbi Dei declamatio*—can hardly be taken seriously, as it was regarded by the author himself rather as a clever paradox. Francis Sanchez, on the other hand, formulated a tenable theory of the impossibility of knowing anything. A riper theory of perception, following Paracelsus and anticipating Leibnitz, was that of Edward Digby, based on the notion of the active correspondence between mind and matter.

To the thinker of the sixteenth century the solution of the question of the ultimate reality seemed to demand some form of identification of the world-soul with matter. Paracelsus and Gilbert both felt in the direction of hylozoism, or the theory of the animation of all things. If logically carried out, as it was not by them, this would have meant that everything was God. The other alternative, that God was everything, was developed by a remarkable man, who felt for the new science the enthusiasm of a religious convert, Giordano Bruno.

Born at Nola near Naples, he entered in his fifteenth year the Dominican friary. This step he soon regretted, and, after being disciplined for disobedience, fled, first to Rome and then to Geneva. Thence he wandered to France, to England,

and to Wittenberg and Prague, lecturing at several universities, including Oxford. In 1593 he was lured back to Italy, was imprisoned by the Inquisition, and after long years was finally burnt at the stake in Rome.

In religion Bruno was an eclectic, if not a skeptic. At Wittenberg he spoke of Luther as "a second Hercules who bound the three-headed and triply-crowned hound of hell and forced him to vomit forth his poison." But in Italy he wrote that he despised the Reformers as more ignorant than himself. His *Expulsion of the Triumphant Beast*, in the disguise of an attack on the heathen mythology, is in reality an assault on revealed religion. His treatise *On the Heroic Passions* aims to show that moral virtues are not founded on religion but on reason.

The enthusiasm that Bruno lacked for religion he felt in almost boundless measure for the new astronomy, "by which," as he himself wrote, "we are moved to discover the infinite cause of an infinite effect, and are led to contemplate the deity not as though outside, apart, and distant from us, but in ourselves. For, as deity is situated wholly everywhere, so it is as near us as we can be to ourselves." From Nicholas of Cusa Bruno had learned that God may be found in the smallest as in the greatest things in the world; the smallest being as endless in power as the greatest is infinite in energy, and all being united in the "Monad," or "the One." Now, Bruno's philosophy is nothing but the cosmological implication and the metaphysical justification of the Copernican theory in the conceptual terms of Nicholas of Cusa.

Liberated from the tyranny of dogma and of the senses, dazzled by the whirling maze of worlds without end scattered like blazing sparks throughout space, drunk with the thought of infinity, he poured forth a paean of breathing thoughts and burning words to celebrate his new faith, the religion of science. The universe for him was composed of atoms, tiny "minima" that admit no further division. Each one of these is a "monad," or unity, comprised in some higher unity until finally "the monad of monads" was found in God. But this was no tribal Jehovah, no personal, anthropomorphic deity, but a First Principle, nearly identical with Natural Law.

## Chapter 4

### The Temper of the Times

#### § 1. Tolerance and Intolerance

BECAUSE RELIGION has in the past protested its own intolerance the most loudly, it is commonly regarded as the field of persecution *par excellence*. This is so far from being the case that it is just in the field of religion that the greatest liberty has been, after a hard struggle, won. It is as if the son who refused to work in the vineyard had been forcibly hauled thither, whereas the other son, admitting his willingness to go, had been left out. Nowadays in most civilized countries a man would suffer more inconvenience by going bare-foot and long-haired than by proclaiming novel religious views; he would be in vastly more danger by opposing the prevalent patriotic or economic doctrines, or by violating some possibly irrational convention, than he would by declaring his agnosticism or atheism. The reason of this state of things is that in the field of religion a tremendous battle between opposing faiths was once fought, with exhaustion as the result, and that the rationalists then succeeded in imposing on the two parties, convinced that neither could exterminate the other, respect for each other's rights.

This battle was fought in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Almost all religions and almost all statesmen were then equally intolerant when they had the power to be so. The Catholic church, with that superb consistency that no new light can alter, has always asserted that the opinion that everyone should have freedom of conscience was "madness flowing from the most foul fountain of indifference."<sup>1</sup> Augustine believed that the church should "compel men to enter in" to the kingdom, by force. Aquinas argued that faith is a virtue, infidelity of those who have heard the truth a sin, and that "heretics deserve not only to be excommunicated

<sup>1</sup> Gregory XVI, Encyclical, *Mirari vos*, 1832.



but to be put to death." One of Luther's propositions condemned by the bull *Exsurge Domine* was that it is against the will of the Holy Ghost to put heretics to death. When Erasmus wrote: "Who ever heard orthodox bishops incite kings to slaughter heretics who were nothing else than heretics?" the proposition was condemned, by the Sorbonne, as repugnant to the laws of nature, of God and of man. The power of the pope to depose and punish heretical princes was asserted in the bull of February 15, 1559.

The theory of the Catholic church was put into instant practice; the duty of persecution was carried out by the Holy Office, of which Lord Acton, though himself a Catholic, has said:<sup>2</sup>

The Inquisition is peculiarly the weapon and peculiarly the work of the popes. It stands out from all those things in which they co-operated, followed or assented, as the distinctive feature of papal Rome. . . . It is the principal thing with which the papacy is identified and by which it must be judged. The principle of the Inquisition is murderous, and a man's opinion of the papacy is regulated and determined by his opinion about religious assassination.

But Acton's judgment, just, as it is severe, is not the judgment of the church. A prelate of the papal household published in 1895, the following words in the *Annales ecclesiastici*:<sup>3</sup>

Some sons of darkness nowadays with dilated nostrils and wild eyes inveigh against the intolerance of the Middle Ages. But let not us, blinded by that liberalism that bewitches under the guise of wisdom, seek for silly little reasons to defend the Inquisition! Let no one speak of the condition of the times and intemperate zeal, as if the church needed excuses. O blessed flames of those pyres by which a very few crafty and insignificant persons were taken away that hundreds of hundreds of phalanxes of

<sup>2</sup> *Letters to Mary Gladstone*, ed. H. Paul, 1904, p. 298f.

<sup>3</sup> C. Mirbt: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums*, 3, 1911, p. 390.

souls should be saved from the jaws of error and eternal damnation! O noble and venerable memory of Torquemada!

So much for the Catholics. If any one still harbors the traditional prejudice that the early Protestants were more liberal, he must be undeceived. Save for a few splendid sayings of Luther, confined to the early years when he was powerless, there is hardly anything to be found among the leading reformers in favor of freedom of conscience. As soon as they had the power to persecute they did.

In his first period Luther expressed the theory of toleration as well as anyone can. He wrote: "The pope is no judge of matters pertaining to God's Word and the faith, but a Christian must examine and judge them himself, as he must live and die by them." Again he said: "Heresy can never be prevented by force. . . . Heresy is a spiritual thing; it cannot be cut with iron nor burnt with fire nor drowned in water." And yet again, "Faith is free. What could a heresy trial do? No more than make people agree by mouth or in writing; it could not compel the heart. For true is the proverb: 'Thoughts are free of taxes.'" Even when the Anabaptists began to preach doctrines that he thoroughly disliked, Luther at first advised the government to leave them unmolested to teach and believe what they liked, "be it gospel or lies."

But alas for the inconsistency of human nature! When Luther's party ripened into success, he saw things quite differently. The first impulse came from the civil magistrate, whom the theologians at first endured, then justified and finally urged on. All persons save priests were forbidden by the Elector John of Saxony to preach or baptize, a measure aimed at the Anabaptists. In the same year, under this law, twelve men and one woman were put to death, and such executions were repeated several times in the following years, e.g. in 1530, 1532 and 1538. In the year 1529 came the terrible imperial law, passed by an alliance of Catholics and Lutherans at the Diet of Spires, condemning all Anabaptists to death, and interpreted to cover cases of simple heresy in

which no breath of sedition mingled. A regular inquisition was set up in Saxony, with Melanchthon on the bench, and under it many persons were punished, some with death, some with life imprisonment, and some with exile.

While Luther took no active part in these proceedings, and on several occasions gave the opinion that exile was the only proper punishment, he also, at other times, justified persecution on the ground that he was suppressing not heresy but blasphemy. As he interpreted blasphemy, in a work published about 1530, it included the papal mass, the denial of the divinity of Christ or of any other "manifest article of the faith, clearly grounded in Scripture and believed throughout Christendom." The government should also, in his opinion, put to death those who preached sedition, anarchy or the abolition of private property.

Melanchthon was far more active in the pursuit of heretics than was his older friend. He reckoned the denial of infant baptism, or of original sin, and the opinion that the eucharistic bread did not contain the real body and blood of Christ, as blasphemy properly punishable by death. He blamed Brenz for his tolerance, asking why we should pity heretics more than does God, who sends them to eternal torment? Brenz was convinced by this argument and became a persecutor himself.

The Strassburgers, who tried to take a position intermediate between Lutherans and Zwinglians, were as intolerant as any one else. They put to death a man for saying that Christ was a mere man and a false prophet, and then defended this act in a long manifesto asking whether all religious customs of antiquity, such as the violation of women, be tolerated, and, if not, why they should draw the line at those who aimed not at the physical dishonor, but at the eternal damnation, of their wives and daughters?

The Swiss also punished for heresy. Felix Manz was put to death by drowning, the method of punishment chosen as a practical satire on his doctrine of baptism of adults by immersion. At the same time George Blaurock was cruelly beaten and banished under threat of death. Zurich, Berne

and St. Gall published a joint edict condemning Anabaptists to death, and under this law two Anabaptists were sentenced in 1528 and two more in 1532.

In judicially murdering Servetus the Genevans were absolutely consistent with Calvin's theory. In the preface to the *Institutes* he admitted the right of the government to put heretics to death and only argued that Protestants were not heretics. Grounding himself on the law of Moses, he said that the death decreed by God to idolatry in the Old Testament was a universal law binding on Christians. He thought that Christians should hate the enemies of God as much as did David, and when Renée of Ferrara suggested that that law might have been abrogated by the new dispensation, Calvin retorted that any such gloss on a plain text would overturn the whole Bible. Calvin went further, and when Castellio argued that heretics should not be punished with death, Calvin said that those who defended heretics in this manner were equally culpable and should be equally punished.

Given the premises of the theologians, their arguments were unanswerable. Of late the opinion has prevailed that his faith cannot be wrong whose life is in the right. But then it was believed that the creed was the all-important thing; that God would send to hell those who entertained wrong notions of his scheme of salvation. "We utterly abhor," says the Scots' Confession of 1560, "the blasphemy of those that affirm that men who live according to equity and justice shall be saved, what religion so ever they have professed."

Against this flood of bigotry a few Christians ventured to protest in the name of their master. In general, the persecuted sects, Anabaptists and Unitarians, were firmly for tolerance, by which their own position would have been improved. Erasmus was thoroughly tolerant in spirit and though he never wrote a treatise specially devoted to the subject, uttered many *obiter dicta* in favor of mercy and wrote many letters to the great ones of the earth interceding for the oppressed. His broad sympathies, his classical tastes, his horror of the tumult, and his Christ-like spirit, would

not have permitted him to resort to the coarse arms of rack and stake even against infidels and Turks.

The noblest plea for tolerance from the Christian standpoint was that written by Sebastian Castellio as a protest against the execution of Servetus. He collects all the authorities ancient and modern, the latter including Luther and Erasmus and even some words, inconsistent with the rest of his life, written by Calvin himself. "The more one knows of the truth the less one is inclined to condemnation of others," he wisely observes, and yet, "there is no sect which does not condemn all others and wish to reign alone. Thence come banishments, exiles, chains, imprisonments, burnings, scaffolds and the miserable rage of torture and torment that is plied every day because of some opinions not pleasing to the government, or even because of things unknown." But Christians burn not only infidels but even each other, for the heretic calls on the name of Christ as he perishes in agony.

Who would not think that Christ were Moloch, or some such god, if he wished that men be immolated to him and burnt alive? . . . Imagine that Christ, the judge of all, were present and himself pronounced sentence and lit the fire,—who would not take Christ for Satan? For what else would Satan do than burn those who call on the name of Christ? O Christ, creator of the world, dost thou see such things? And hast thou become so totally different from what thou wast, so cruel and contrary to thyself? When thou wast on earth, there was no one gentler or more compassionate or more patient of injuries.

Calvin called upon his henchman Beza to answer this "blasphemy" of one that must surely be "the chosen vessel of Satan." Beza replied to Castellio that God had given the sword to the magistrate not to be borne in vain and that it was better to have even a cruel tyrant than to allow everyone to do as he pleased. Those who forbid the punishment of heresy are, in Beza's opinion, despisers of God's Word and



might as well say that even parricides should not be chastized.

Two authors quoted in favor of tolerance more than they deserve to be are Sir Thomas More and Montaigne. In *Utopia*, indeed, there was no persecution, save of the fanatic who wished to persecute others. But even in *Utopia* censure of the government by a private individual was punishable by death. And, twelve years after the publication of the *Utopia*, More came to argue "that the burning of heretics is lawful and well done," and he did it himself accordingly. The reason he gave, in his *Dialogue*, was that heretics also persecute, and that it would put the Catholics at an unfair disadvantage to allow heresy to wax unhindered until it grew great enough to crush them. There is something in this argument. It is like that today used against disarmament, that any nation which started it would put itself at the mercy of its rivals.

The spirit of Montaigne was thoroughly tolerant, because he was always able to see both sides of everything; one might even say that he was negatively suggestible, and always saw the "other" side of an opinion better than he saw his own side of it. He never came out strongly for toleration, but he made two extremely sage remarks about it. The first was that it was setting a high value on our own conjectures to put men to death for their sake. The second was thus phrased, in the old English translation: "It might be urged that to give factions the bridle to uphold their opinion, is by that facility and ease, the ready way to mollify and release them; and to blunt the edge, which is sharpened by rareness, novelty and difficulty."

Had the course of history been decided by weight of argument, persecution would have been fastened on the world forever, for the consensus of opinion was overwhelmingly against liberty of conscience. But just as individuals are rarely converted on any vital question by argument, so the course of races and of civilizations is decided by factors lying deeper than the logic of publicists can reach. Modern toleration developed from two very different sources; by one of which the whole point of view of the race has changed, and by the other of which a truce between warring factions, at first imposed as

bitter necessity, has developed, because of its proved value, into a permanent peace.

The first cause of modern tolerance is the growing rationalism of which the seeds were sown by the Renaissance. The generation before Luther saw an almost unparalleled liberty in the expression of learned opinion. Valla could attack pope, Bible and Christian ethics; Pomponazzi could doubt the immortality of the soul; More could frame a Utopia of deists, and Machiavelli could treat religion as an instrument in the hands of knaves to dupe fools. As far as it went this liberty was admirable; but it was really narrow and "academic" in the worst sense of the word. The scholars who vindicated for themselves the right to say and think what they pleased in the learned tongue and in university halls, never dreamed that the people had the same rights. Even Erasmus was always urging Luther not to communicate imprudent truths to the vulgar, and when he kept on doing so Erasmus was so vexed that he "cared not whether Luther was roasted or boiled" for it. Erasmus's good friend Ammonius jocosely complained that heretics were so plentiful in England in 1511 before the Reformation had been heard of, that the demand for faggots to burn them was enhancing the price of fire-wood. Indeed, in this enlightened era of the Renaissance, what porridge was handed to the common people? What was free, except dentistry, to the Jews, expelled from Spain and Portugal and persecuted everywhere else? What tolerance was extended to the Hussites? What mercy was shown to the Lollards or to Savonarola?

Paradoxical as it may seem to say it, after what has been said of the intolerance of the Reformers, the second cause that extended modern freedom of conscience from the privileged few to the masses, was the Reformation. Overclouding, as it did for a few years, all the glorious culture of the Renaissance with a dark mist of fanaticism, it nevertheless proved, contrary to its own purpose, one of the two parents of liberty. What neither the common ground of the Christians in doctrine, nor their vaunted love of God, nor their enlightenment by the Spirit, could produce, was finally wrung

from their mutual and bitter hatreds. Of all the fair flowers that have sprung from a dark and noisome soil, that of religious liberty, sprouting from religious war has been the fairest.

The steps were gradual. First, after the long deadlock of Lutheran and Catholic, came to be worked out the principle of the toleration of the two churches, embodied in the Peace of Augsburg. The Compact of Warsaw granted absolute religious liberty to the nobles. The people of the Netherlands, sickened with slaughter in the name of the faith, took a longer step in the direction of toleration in the Union of Utrecht. The government of Elizabeth, acting from prudential motives only, created and maintained an extra-legal tolerance of Catholics, again and again refusing to molest those who were peaceable and quiet. The papists even hoped to obtain legal recognition when Francis Bacon proposed to tolerate all Christians except those who refused to fight a foreign enemy. France found herself in a like position, and solved it by allowing the two religions to live side by side in the Edict of Nantes. The furious hatred of the Christians for each other blazed forth in the Thirty Years War, but after that lesson persecution on a large scale was at an end. Indeed, before its end, wide religious liberty had been granted in some of the American colonies, notably in Rhode Island and Maryland.

## § 2. Witchcraft

Some analogy to the wave of persecution and confessional war that swept over Europe at this time can be found in the witchcraft craze. Both were examples of those manias to which mankind is periodically subject. They run over the face of the earth like epidemics or as a great fire consumes a city. Beginning in a few isolated cases, so obscure as to be hard to trace, the mania gathers strength until it burns with its maximum fierceness and then, having exhausted itself, as it were, dies away, often quite suddenly. Such manias were the Children's Crusade and the zeal of the flagellants in the Middle Ages. Such have been the mad speculations as that of the South Sea Bubble and the panics

that repeatedly visit our markets. To the same category belong the religious and superstitious delusions of the sixteenth century.

The history of these mental epidemics is easier to trace than their causes. Certainly, reason does nothing to control them. In almost every case there are a few sane men to point out, with perfect rationality, the nature of the folly to their contemporaries, but in all cases their words fall on deaf ears. They are mocked, imprisoned, sometimes put to death for their pains, whereas any fanatical fool that adds fuel to the flame of current passion is listened to, rewarded and followed.

The original stuff from which the mania was wrought is a savage survival. Hebrew and Roman law dealt with witchcraft. The Middle Ages saw the survival of magic, still called in Italy, "the old religion," and new superstitions added to it. Something of the ancient enchantment still lies upon the fairylands of Europe. In the Apennines one sometimes comes upon a grove of olives or cypresses as gnarled and twisted as the tortured souls that Dante imagined them to be. Who can wander through the heaths and mountains of the Scotch Highlands, with their uncanny harmonies of silver mist and grey cloud and glint of water and bare rock and heather, and not see in the distance the Weird Sisters crooning over their horrible cauldron? In Germany the forests are magic-mad. Walking under the huge oaks of the Thuringian Forest or the Taunus, or in the pine woods of Hesse, one can see the flutter of airy garments in the chequered sunlight falling upon fern and moss; one can glimpse goblins and kobolds hiding behind the roots and rocks; one can hear the King of the Willows<sup>4</sup> and the Bride of the Wind moaning and calling in the rustling of the leaves. On a summer's day the calm of pools is so complete that it seems as if, according to Luther's words, the throwing of a stone into the water would raise a tempest. But on moonlit, windy, Walpurgis Night, witches audibly ride by, hooted at by the owls, and vast spectres dance in the cloud-banks beyond the Brocken.

<sup>4</sup> Erlikönig.

The witch has become a typical figure: she was usually a simple, old woman living in a lonely cottage with a black cat, gathering herbs by the light of the moon. But she was not always an ancient beldam; some witches were known as the purest and fairest maidens of the village; some were ladies in high station; some were men. A ground for suspicion was sometimes furnished by the fact that certain charlatans playing upon the credulity of the ignorant, professed to be able by sorcery to find money, "to provoke persons to love," or to consume the body and goods of a client's enemy. Black magic was occasionally resorted to to get rid of personal or political enemies. More often a wise woman would be sought for her skill in herbs and her very success in making cures would sometimes be her undoing.

If the witch was a domestic article in Europe, the devil was an imported luxury from Asia. Like Aeneas and many another foreign conquerer, when he came to rule the land he married its princess—in this case Hulda the pristine goddess of love and beauty—and adopted many of the native customs. It is difficult for us to imagine what a personage the devil was in the age of the Reformation. Like all geniuses he had a large capacity for work and paid great attention to detail. Frequently he took the form of a cat or a black dog with horns to frighten children by "skipping to and fro and sitting upon the top of a nettle"; again he would obligingly hold a review of evil spirits for the satisfaction of Benvenuto Cellini's curiosity. He was at the bottom of all the earthquakes, pestilences, famines and wars of the century, and also, if we may trust their mutual recriminations, he was the special patron of the pope on the one hand and of Calvin on the other. Luther often talked with him, though in doing so the sweat poured from his brow and his heart almost stopped beating. Luther admitted that the devil always got the best of an argument and could only be banished by some unprintably nasty epithets hurled at his head. Satan and his satellites often took the form of men or women and under the name of incubi and succubi had sexual intercourse with mortals. One of the most abominable features of the witch craze was that during its height hundreds of



children of four or five years old confessed to being the devil's paramours.

So great was the power of Satan that, in the common belief, many persons bartered their souls to him in return for supernatural gifts in this life. To compensate them for the loss of their salvation, these persons, the witches, were enabled to do acts of petty spite to their neighbors, turning milk sour, blighting crops, causing sickness to man and animals, making children cry themselves to death before baptism, rendering marriages barren, procuring abortion, and giving charms to blind a husband to his wife's adultery, **or philters to compel love.**

On certain nights the witches and devils met for the celebration of blasphemous and obscene rites in an assembly known as the Witches' Sabbath. To enable themselves to ride to the meeting-place on broomsticks, the witches procured a communion wafer, applied a toad to it, burned it, mingled its ashes with the blood of an infant, the powdered bones of a hanged man and certain herbs. The meeting then indulged in a parody of the mass, for, so the grave doctors taught, as Christ had his sacraments the devil had his "unsacraments" or "excrements." His Satanic Majesty took the form of a goat, dog, cat or ape and received the homage of his subjects in a loathsome ceremony. After a banquet promiscuous intercourse of devils and witches followed.

All this superstition smouldered along in the embers of folk tales for centuries until it was blown into a devastating blaze by the breath of theologians who started to try to blow it out. The first puff was given by Innocence VIII in his bull *Summis desiderantes*. The Holy Father having learned with sorrow that many persons in Germany had had intercourse with demons and had by incantations hindered the birth of children and blasted the fruits of the earth, gave authority to Henry Institoris and James Sprenger to correct, incarcerate, punish and fine such persons, calling in, if need be, the aid of the secular arm. These gentlemen acquitted themselves with unsurpassed zeal. Not content with trying and punishing people brought before them, they put forth *The Witches' Hammer*, called by Lea the most portentous

monument of superstition ever produced. In the next two centuries it was printed twenty-nine times. The University of Cologne at once decided that to doubt the reality of witchcraft was a crime. The Spanish Inquisition, on the other hand, having all it could do with Jews and heretics, treated witchcraft as a diabolical delusion.

Though most men, including those whom we consider the choice and master-spirits of the age, Erasmus and More, firmly believed in the objective reality of witchcraft, they were not obsessed by the subject, as were their immediate posterity. Two causes may be found for the intensification of the fanaticism. The first was the use of torture by the Inquisition. The crime was of such a nature that it could hardly be proved save by confession, and this, in general, could be extracted only by the infliction of pain. It is instructive to note that in England where the spirit of the law was averse to torture, no progress in witch-hunting took place until a substitute for the rack had been found, first in pricking the body of the witch with pins to find the anaesthetic spot supposed to mark her, and secondly in depriving her of sleep.

A second patent cause of the mania was the zeal and the bibliolatry of Protestantism. The religious debate heated the spiritual atmosphere and turned men's thoughts to the world of spirits. Such texts, continually harped upon, as that on the witch of Endor, the injunction, "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live," and the demoniacs of the New Testament, weighed heavily upon the shepherds of the people and upon their flocks. Of the reality of witchcraft Luther harbored not a doubt. The first use he made of the ban was to excommunicate reputed witches. Seeing an idiotic child, whom he regarded as a changeling, he recommended the authorities to drown it, as a body without a soul. Repeatedly, both in private talk and in public sermons, he recommended that witches should be put to death without mercy and without regard to legal niceties. As a matter of fact, four witches were burned at Wittenberg on June 29, 1540.

The other Protestants hastened to follow the bad example of their master. In Geneva, under Calvin, thirty-four women

were burned or quartered for the crime in the year 1545. A sermon of Bishop Jewel in 1562 was perhaps the occasion of a new English law against witchcraft. Richard Baxter wrote on the *Certainty of a World of Spirits*. At a much later time the bad record of the Mathers is well known, as also John Wesley's remark that giving up witchcraft meant giving up the Bible.

After the mania reached its height in the closing years of the century, anything, however trivial, would arouse suspicion. A cow would go dry, or a colt break its leg, or there would be a drought, or a storm, or a murrain on the cattle or a mildew on the crops. Or else a physician, baffled by some disease that did not yield to his treatment of bleeding and to his doses of garlic and horses' dung, would suggest that witchcraft was the reason for his failure. In fact, if any contrariety met the path of the ordinary man or woman, he or she immediately thought of the black art, and considered the most likely person for denunciation. This would naturally be the nearest old woman, especially if she had a tang to her tongue and had muttered "Bad luck to you!" on some previous occasion. She would then be hauled before the court, promised liberty if she confessed, stripped and examined for some mark of Satan or to be sure that she was not hiding a charm about her person. Torture in some form was then applied, and a ghastly list it was, pricking with needles under nails, crushing of bones until the marrow spurted out, wrenching of the head with knotted cords, toasting the feet before a fire, suspending the victim by the hands tied behind the back and letting her drop until the shoulders were disjoined. The horrible work would be kept up until the poor woman either died under the torture, or confessed, when she was sentenced without mercy, usually to be burned, sometimes to lesser punishments.

When the madness was at its height, hardly anyone, once accused, escaped. John Bodin, a man otherwise enlightened and learned, earned himself the not unjust name of "Satan's attorney-general" by urging that strict proof could not be demanded by the very nature of these cases and that no suspected person should ever be released unless the malice

of her accusers was plainer than day. Moreover, each trial bred others, for each witch denounced accomplices until almost the whole population of certain districts was suspected. So frequently did they accuse their judges or their sovereign of having assisted at the witches' sabbath, that this came to be discounted as a regular trick of the devil.

Persecution raged in some places, chiefly in Germany, like a visitation of pestilence or war. Those who tried to stop it fell victims to their own courage, and, unless they recanted, languished for years in prison, or were executed as possessed by devils themselves. At Trèves the persecution was encouraged by the cupidity of the magistrates who profited by confiscation of the property of those sentenced. At Bonn schoolboys of nine or ten, fair young maidens, many priests and scores of good women were done to death.

No figures have been compiled for the total number of victims of this insanity. In England, under Elizabeth, before the craze had more than well started on its career, 125 persons are known to have been tried for witchcraft and 47 are known to have been executed for the crime. In Venice the Inquisition punished 199 persons for sorcery during the sixteenth century. In the year 1510, 140 witches were burned at Brescia, in 1514, 300 at Como. In a single year the bishop of Geneva burned 500 witches, the bishop of Bamberg 600, the bishop of Würzburg 900. About 800 were condemned to death in a single batch by the Senate of Savoy. In the year 1586 the archbishop of Trèves burned 118 women and two men for this imaginary crime. Even these figures give but an imperfect notion of the extent of the midsummer madness. The number of victims must be reckoned by the tens of thousands.

Throughout the century there were not wanting some signs of a healthy skepticism. When, during an epidemic of St. Vitus's dance at Strassburg, the citizens proposed a pilgrimage to stop it, the episcopal vicar replied that as it was a natural disease natural remedies should be used. Just as witches were becoming common in England, Gosson wrote in his *School of Abuse*: "Do not imitate those foolish patients, who, having sought all means of recovery and are

never the nearer, run into witchcraft." Leonardo da Vinci called belief in necromancy the most foolish of all human delusions.

As it was dangerous to oppose the popular mood at its height, the more honor must go to the few who wrote *ex professo* against it. The first of these, of any note, was the Protestant physician John Weyer. In his book *De praestigiis daemonum* he sought very cautiously to show that the poor "old, feeble-minded, stay-at-home women" sentenced for witchcraft were simply the victims of their own and other people's delusions. Satan has no commerce with them save to injure their minds and corrupt their imaginations. Quite different, he thought, were those infamous magicians who really used spells, charms, potions and the like, though even here Weyer did not admit that their effects were due to supernatural agency. This mild and cautious attempt to defend the innocent was placed on the Index and elicited the opinion from John Bodin that the author was a true servant of Satan.

A far more thorough and brilliant attack on the superstition was Reginald Scott's *Discovery of Witchcraft, wherein the lewd dealings of Witches and Witchmongers is notably detected . . . whereunto is added a Treatise upon the Nature and Substance of Spirits and Devils*. Scott had read 212 Latin authors and 23 English, on his subject, and he was under considerable obligation to some of them, notably Weyer. But he endeavored to make first-hand observations, attended witch trials and traced gossip to its source. He showed, none better, the utter flimsiness and absurdity of the charges on which poor old women were done to death. He explained the performance of the witch of Endor as ventriloquism. Trying to prove that magic was rejected by reason and religion alike, he pointed out that all the phenomena might most easily be explained by wilful imposture or by illusion due to mental disturbance. As his purpose was the humanitarian one of staying the cruel persecution, with calculated partisanship he tried to lay the blame for it on the Catholic church. As the very existence of magic could not be disproved completely by empirical reasons he attacked



it on *a priori* grounds, alleging that spirits and bodies are in two categories, unable to act directly upon each other. Brilliant and convincing as the work was, it produced no corresponding effect. It was burned publicly by order of James I.

Montaigne, who was never roused to anger by anything, had the supreme art of rebutting others' opinions without seeming to do so. It was doubtless Bodin's abominable *Demonology* that called forth his celebrated essay on witchcraft, in which that subject is treated in the most modern spirit. The old presumption in favor of the miraculous has fallen completely from him; his cool, quizzical regard was too much for Satan, who, with all his knowledge of the world, is easily embarrassed, to endure. The delusion of witchcraft might be compared to a noxious bacillus. Scott tried to kill it by heat; he held it up to a fire of indignation, and fairly boiled it in his scorching flame of reason. Montaigne tried the opposite treatment: refrigeration. He attacked nothing; he only asked, with an icy smile, why anything should be believed. Certainly, as long as the mental passions could be kept at his own low temperature, there was no danger that the milk of human kindness should turn sour, no matter what vicious culture of germs it originally held. He begins by saying that he had seen various miracles in his own day, but, one reads between the lines, he doesn't believe any of them. One error, he says, begets another, and everything is exaggerated in the hope of making converts to the talker's opinion. One miracle bruited all over France turned out to be a prank of young people counterfeiting ghosts. When one hears a marvel, he should always say, "perhaps." Better be apprentices at sixty than doctors at ten. Now witches, he continues, are the subject of the wildest and most foolish accusations. Bodin had proposed that they should be killed on mere suspicion, but Montaigne observes, "To kill human beings there is required a bright-shining and clear light." And what do the stories amount to?

How much more natural and more likely do I find it that two men should lie than that one in twelve hours should pass from east to west? How much more natural that our

understanding may by the volubility of our loose-carping mind be transported from his place, than that one of us should by a strange spirit in flesh and bone be carried upon a broom through the tunnel of a chimney? . . . I deem it a matter pardonable not to believe a wonder, at least so far forth as one may explain away or break down the truth of the report in some way not miraculous. . . . Some years past I traveled through the country of a sovereign prince, who, in favor of me and to abate my incredulity, did me the grace in his own presence and in a particular place to make me see ten or twelve prisoners of that kind, and amongst others an old beldam witch, a true and perfect sorceress, both by her ugliness and deformity, and such a one as long before was most famous in that profession. I saw both proofs, witnesses, voluntary confessions, and some insensible marks about this miserable old woman; I enquired and talked with her a long time, with the greatest heed and attention I could, and I am not easily carried away by preconceived opinion. In the end and in my conscience I should rather have appointed them hellebore than hemlock. It was rather a disease than a crime.\*

Montaigne goes on to argue that even when we cannot get an explanation—and any explanation is more probable than magic—it is safe to disbelieve: "Fear sometimes representeth strange apparitions to the vulgar sort, as ghosts . . . larves, hobgoblins, Robbingood-fellows and such other bugbears and chimaeras." For Montaigne the evil spell upon the mind of the race had been broken; alas! that it took so long for other men to throw it off!

### § 3. Education

From the most terrible superstition let us turn to the noblest, most inspiring and most important work of humanity. With each generation the process of handing on to posterity the full heritage of the race has become longer and more complex.

It was, therefore, upon a very definite and highly developed course of instruction that the contemporary of Erasmus

\* Montaigne, *Essays*.

entered. There were a few great endowed schools, like Eton and Winchester and Deventer, in which the small boy might begin to learn his "grammar"—Latin, of course. Some of the buildings at Winchester and Eton are the same now as they were then, the quite beautiful chapel and dormitories of red brick at Eton, for example. Each of these two English schools had, at this time, less than 150 pupils, and but two masters, but the great Dutch school, Deventer, under the renowned tuition of Hegius, boasted 2200 scholars, divided into eight forms. Many an old woodcut shows us the pupils gathered around the master as thick as flies, sitting cross-legged on the floor, some intent on their books and others playing pranks, while there seldom fails to be one undergoing the chastisement so highly recommended by Solomon. These great schools did not suffice for all would-be scholars. In many villages there was some poor priest or master who would teach the boys what he knew and prepare them thus for higher things. In some places there were tiny school-houses, much like those now seen in rural America. Such an one, renovated, may be still visited at Mansfeld, and its quaint inscription read over the door, to the effect that a good school is like the wooden horse of Troy. When the boys left home they lived more as they do now at college, being given a good deal of freedom out of hours. The poorer scholars used their free times to beg, for as many were supported in this way then as now are given scholarships and other charitable aids in our universities.

Though there were a good many exceptions, most of the teachers were brutes. The profession was despised as a menial one and indeed, even so, many a gentleman took more care in the selection of grooms and gamekeepers than he did in choosing the men with whom to entrust his children. Of many of the tutors the manners and morals were alike outrageous. They used filthy language to the boys, whipped them cruelly and habitually drank too much. They made the examinations, says one unfortunate pupil of such a master, like a trial for murder. The monitor employed to spy on the boys was known by the significant name of "the wolf." Public opinion then approved of harsh methods

Nicholas Udall, the talented head-master of Eton, was warmly commended for being "the best flogging teacher in England"—until he was removed for his immorality.

The principal study—after the rudiments of reading and writing the mother tongue were learned—was Latin. As, at the opening of the century, there were usually not enough books to go around, the pedagogue would dictate declensions and conjugations, with appropriate exercises, to his pupils. The books used were such as *Donatus on the Parts of Speech*, a poem called the *Facetus* by John of Garland, intended to give moral, theological and grammatical information all in one, and selecting as the proper vehicle rhymed couplets. Other manuals were the *Floretus*, a sort of abstruse catechism, the *Cornutus*, a treatise on synonyms, and a dictionary in which the words were arranged not alphabetically but according to their supposed etymology—thus *hirundo* (swallow) from *aer* (air). One had to know the meaning of the word before one searched for it! The grammars were written in a barbarous Latin of inconceivably difficult style. Can any man now readily understand the following definition of "pronoun," taken from a book intended for beginners, published in 1499? "Pronomen . . . significat substantiam seu entitatem sub modo conceptus intrinseco permanentis seu habitus et quietis sub determinatae apprehensionis formalitate."

That with all these handicaps boys learned Latin at all, and some boys learned it extremely well, must be attributed to the amount of time spent on the subject. For years it was practically all that was studied—for the medieval trivium of grammar, rhetoric and logic reduced itself to this—and they not only read a great deal but wrote and spoke Latin. Finally, it became as easy and fluent to them as their own tongue. Many instances that sound like infant prodigies are known to us; boys who spoke Latin at seven and wrote eloquent orations in it at fourteen, were not uncommon. It is true that the average boy spoke then rather a translation of his own language into Latin than the best idiom of Rome. The following ludicrous specimens of conversation, throwing light on the manners as well as on the linguistic attainments of the

students, were overheard in the University of Paris: "Capis me pro uno alio"; "Quando ego veni de ludendo, ego bibi unum magnum vitrum totum plenum de vino, sine deponendo nasum de vitro"; "In prandendo non facit nisi lichare suos digitos."

Though there was no radical reform in education during the century between Erasmus and Shakespeare, two strong tendencies may be discerned at work, one looking towards a milder method, the other towards the extension of elementary instruction to large classes hitherto left illiterate. The Reformation, which was rather poor in original thought, was at any rate a tremendous vulgarizer of the current culture. It was a popular movement in that it passed around to the people the ideas that had hitherto been the possession of the few. Its first effect, indeed, together with that of the tumults that accompanied it, was for the moment unfavorable to all sorts of learning. Not only wars and rebellions frightened the youth from school, but men arose, both in England and Germany, who taught that if God had vouchsafed his secrets to babes and sucklings, ignorance must be better than wisdom and that it was therefore folly to be learned.

Luther not only turned the tide, but started it flowing in that great wave that has finally given civilized lands free and compulsory education for all. In a *Letter to the Aldermen and Cities of Germany on the Erection and Maintenance of Christian Schools* he urged strongly the advantages of learning. "Good schools [he maintained] are the tree from which grow all good conduct in life, and if they decay great blindness must follow in religion and in all useful arts. . . . Therefore, all wise rulers have thought schools a great light in civil life." Even the heathen had seen that their children should be instructed in all liberal arts and sciences both to fit them for war and government and to give them personal culture. Luther several times suggested that "the civil authorities ought to compel people to send their children to school. If the government can compel men to bear spear and arquebus, to man ramparts and perform other martial duties, how much more has it the right to compel them to send their children to school?" Repeatedly he urged upon the many



princes and burgomasters with whom he corresponded the duty of providing schools in every town and village. A portion of the ecclesiastical revenues confiscated by the German states was in fact applied to this end. Many other new schools were founded by princes and were known as "Fürstenschulen" or *gymnasia*.

The same course was run in England. Colet's foundation of St. Paul's School in London, for 153 boys, has perhaps won an undue fame, for it was backward in method and not important in any special way, but it is a sign that people at that time were turning their thoughts to the education of the young. When Edward VI mounted the throne the dissolution of the chantries had a very bad effect, for their funds had commonly supported scholars. A few years previously Henry VIII had ordered "every of you that be parsons, vicars, curates and also chantry priests and stipendiaries to . . . teach and bring up in learning the best you can all such children of your parishioners as shall come to you, or at least teach them to read English." Edward VI revived this law in ordering chantry priests to "exercise themselves in teaching youth to read and write," and he also urged people to contribute to the maintenance of primary schools in each parish. He also endowed certain grammar schools with the revenues of the chantries.

In Scotland the *Book of Discipline* advocated compulsory education, children of the well-to-do at their parents' expense, poor children at that of the church.

In Catholic countries, too, there was a passion for founding new schools. Especially to be mentioned are the Jesuit "colleges," "of which," Bacon confesses, "I must say, *Talis cum sis utinam noster esses*." How well frequented they were is shown by the following figures. The Jesuit school at Vienna had, in 1558, 500 pupils, in Cologne, about the same time, 517, in Trèves 500, in Mayence 400, in Spire 453, in Munich 300. The method of the Jesuits became famous for its combined gentleness and art. They developed consummate skill in allowing their pupils as much of history, science and philosophy as they could imbibe without jeopardizing their faith. From this point of view their instruction was an inocu-

lation against free thought. But it must be allowed that their teaching of the classics was excellent. They followed the humanists' methods, but they adapted them to the purpose of the church.

All this flood of new scholars had little that was new to study. Neither Reformers nor humanists had any searching or thorough revision to propose; all that they asked was that the old be taught better: the humanities more humanely. Erasmus wrote much on education, and, following him Vives and Budé and Melanchthon and Sir Thomas Elyot and Roger Ascham; their programs, covering the whole period from the cradle to the highest degree, seem thorough, but what does it all amount to, in the end, but Latin and Greek? Possibly a little arithmetic and geometry and even astronomy were admitted, but all was supposed to be imbibed as a by-product of literature, history from Livy, for example, and natural science from Pliny. Indeed, it often seems as if the knowledge of things was valued chiefly for the sake of literary comprehension and allusion.

The educational reformers differed little from one another save in such details as the best authors to read. Colet preferred Christian authors, such as Lactantius, Prudentius and Baptista Mantuan. Erasmus thought it well to begin with the verses of Dionysius Cato, and to proceed through the standard authors of Greece and Rome. For the sake of making instruction easy and pleasant he wrote his *Colloquies*—in many respects his *chef d'oeuvre* if not the best Latin produced by anyone during the century. In this justly famous work, which was adopted and used by all parties immediately, he conveyed a considerable amount of liberal religious and moral instruction with enough wit to make it palatable. Luther, on Melanchthon's advice, notwithstanding his hatred for the author, urged the use of the *Colloquies* in Protestant schools, and they were likewise among the books permitted by the Imperial mandate issued at Louvain.

The method of learning language was for the instructor to interpret a passage to the class which they were expected to be able to translate the next day. Ascham recommended that, when the child had written a translation he should,

after a suitable interval, he required to retranslate his own English into Latin. Writing, particularly of letters, was taught. The real advance over the medieval curriculum was in the teaching of Greek—to which the exceptionally ambitious school at Geneva added, after 1538, Hebrew. Save for this and the banishment of scholastic barbarism, there was no attempt to bring in the new sciences and arts. For nearly four hundred years the curriculum of Erasmus has remained the foundation of our education. Only in our own times are Latin and Greek giving way, as the staples of mental training, to modern languages and science. In those days modern languages were picked up, as Milton was later to recommend that they should be, not as part of the regular course, but “in some leisure hour,” like music or dancing. Notwithstanding such exceptions as Edward VI and Elizabeth, who spoke French and Italian, there were comparatively few scholars who knew any living tongue save their own.

When the youth went to the university he found little change in either his manner of life or in his studies. A number of boys matriculated at the age of thirteen or fourteen; on the other hand there was a sprinkling of mature students. The extreme youth of many scholars made it natural that they should be under somewhat stricter discipline than is now the case. Even in the early history of Harvard it is recorded that the president once “flogged four bachelors” for being out too late at night. At colleges like Montaigu, if one may believe Erasmus, the path of learning was indeed thorny. What between the wretched diet, the filth, the cold, the crowding, “the short-winged hawks” that the students combed from their hair or shook from their shirts, it is no wonder that many of them fell ill. Gaming, fighting, drinking and wenching were common.

Nominally, the university was then under the entire control of the faculty, who elected one of themselves “rector” (president) for a single year, who appointed their own members and who had complete charge of studies and discipline, save that the students occasionally asserted their ancient rights. In fact, the corporation was pretty well under the thumb of the government, which compelled elections and

dismissals when it saw fit, and occasionally appointed commissions to visit and reform the faculties.

Instruction was still carried on by the old method of lectures and debates. These latter were sometimes on important questions of the day, theological or political, but were often also, nothing but displays of ingenuity. There was a great lack of laboratories, a need that just began to be felt at the end of the century when Bacon wrote: "Unto the deep, fruitful and operative study of many sciences, specially natural philosophy and physics, books be not only the instrumentals." Bacon's further complaint that, "among so many great foundations of colleges in Europe, I find it strange that they are all dedicated to professions, and none left free to arts and sciences at large," is an early hint of the need of the endowment of research. The degrees in liberal arts, B.A. and M.A., were then more strictly than now licences either to teach or to pursue higher professional studies in divinity, law, or medicine. Fees for graduation were heavy; in France a B.A. cost \$24, an M.D. \$690 and a D.D. \$780.

Germany then held the primacy that she has ever since had in Europe both in the number of her universities and in the aggregate of her students. The new universities founded by the Protestants were: Marburg 1527, Königsberg 1544, Jena 1548 and again 1558, Helmstadt 1575, Altdorf 1578, Paderborn 1584. In addition to these the Catholics founded four or five new universities, though not important ones. They concentrated their efforts on the endeavor to found new "colleges" at the old institutions.

In general the universities lost during the first years of the Reformation, but more than made up their numbers by the middle of the century. Wittenberg had 245 matriculations in 1521; in 1526 the matriculations had fallen to 175, but by 1550, notwithstanding the recent Schmalkaldic War, the total numbers had risen to 2000, and this number was well maintained throughout the century.

Erfurt, remaining Catholic in a Protestant region, declined more rapidly and permanently. In the year 1520-21 there

were 311 matriculations, in the following year 120, in the next year 72, and five years later only 14. Between 1521 to 1530 the number of students fell at Rostock from 123 to 33, at Frankfort-on-the-Oder from 73 to 32. Rostock, however, recovered after a reorganization in 1532. The number of students at Greifswald declined so that no lectures were given during the period 1527-39, after which it again began to pick up. Königsberg, starting with 314 students later fell off. Cologne declined in numbers, and so did Mayence until the Jesuits founded their college in 1561, which, by 1568, had 500 pupils recognized as members of the university. Vienna, also, having sunk to the number of 12 students in 1532, kept at a very low ebb until 1554, when the effects of the Jesuit revival were felt. Whereas, during the fifteen years 1508-22 there were 6485 matriculations at Leipzig, during the next fifteen years there were only 1935. By the end of the century, however, Leipzig had again become, under Protestant leadership, a large institution.

Two new universities were founded in the British Isles during the century, Edinburgh in 1582 and Trinity College, Dublin, in 1591. In England a number of colleges were added to those already existing at Oxford and Cambridge, namely Christ Church (first known, after its founder, Wolsey, as Cardinal's College, then as King's College), Brasenose, and Corpus Christi at Oxford and St. John's, Magdalen, and Trinity at Cambridge. Notwithstanding these new foundations the number of students sank. During the years 1542-8, only 191 degrees of B.A. were given at Cambridge and only 172 at Oxford. Ascham is authority for the statement that things were still worse under Mary, when "the wild boar of the wood" either "cut up by the root or trod down to the ground" the institutions of learning. The revenues of the universities reached their low-water mark about 1547, when the total income of Oxford from land was reckoned at £5 and that of Cambridge at £50, per annum. Under Elizabeth, the universities rose in numbers, while better Latin and Greek were taught. It was at this time that a college education became fashionable for young gentlemen



instead of being exclusively patronized by "learned clerks." The foundation of the College of Physicians in London deserves to be mentioned.

A university was founded at Zurich under the influence of Zwingli. Geneva's University opened in 1559 with Beza as rector. Connected with it was a preparatory school of seven forms, with a rigidly prescribed course in the classics. When the boy was admitted to the university proper by examination, he took what he chose; there was not even a division into classes. The courses offered to him included Greek, Hebrew, theology, dialectic, rhetoric, physics and mathematics.

The foundation of the Collège de France by Francis I represented an attempt to bring new life and vigor into learning by a free association of learned men. It was planned to emancipate science from the tutelage of theology. Erasmus was invited but, on his refusal to accept, Budé was given the leading position. Chairs of Greek, Hebrew, mathematics and Latin were founded by the king in 1530. Other institutions of learning founded in France were Rheims 1547, Douai 1562, Besançon<sup>5</sup> 1564, none of them now in existence. Paris continued to be the largest university in the world, with an average number of students of about 6000.

Louvain, in the Netherlands, had 3000 students in 1500 and 1521; in 1550 the number rose to 5000. It was divided into colleges on the plan still found in England. Each college had a president, three professors and twelve fellows, entertained gratis, in addition to a larger number of paying scholars. The most popular classes often reached the number of 300. The foundation of the Collegium Trilingue by Erasmus's friend Jerome Busleiden in 1517 was an attempt, as its name indicates, to give instruction in Greek and Hebrew as well as in the Latin classics. A blight fell upon the noble institution during the wars of religion. Under the supervision of Alva it founded professorships of catechetics and substituted the decrees of the Council of Trent for the *Decretum* of Gratian in the law school. Exhausted by the hemorrhages caused by the Religious War and starved by the Lenten diet

<sup>5</sup> Besançon was then an Imperial Free City.

of Spanish Catholicism, it gradually decayed, while its place was taken in the eyes of Europe by the Protestant University of Leyden. A second Protestant foundation, Franeker, for a time flourished, but finally withered away.

Spanish universities were crowded with new numbers. The maximum student body was reached by Salamanca in 1584 with 6778 men, while Alcalá passed its zenith in 1547 with the respectable enrollment of 1949. The foundation of no less than nine new universities in Spain bears witness to the interest of the Iberian Peninsula in education.

Four new universities opened their doors in Italy during the year 1540-1565. The Sapienza at Rome, in addition to these, was revived temporarily by Leo X in 1513, and, after a relapse to the dormant state, again awoke to its full power under Paul III, when chairs of Greek and Hebrew were established.

The services of all these universities cannot be computed on any statistical method. Notwithstanding all their faults, their dogmatic narrowness and their academic arrogance, they contributed more to progress than any other institutions. Each academy became the center of scientific research and of intellectual life. Their influence was enormous. How much did it mean to that age to see its contending hosts marshalled under two professors, Luther and Adrian VI! And how many other leaders taught in universities:—Erasmus, Melancthon, Reuchlin, Lefèvre, to mention only a few. Pontiffs and kings sought for support in academic pronouncements, nor could they always force the doctors to give the decision they wished. In fact, each university stood like an Acropolis in the republic of letters, at once a temple and a fortress for those who loved truth and ensued it.

#### § 4. Art

The significant thing about art, for the historian as for the average man, is the ideal it expresses. The artist and critic may find more to interest him in the development of technique, how this painter dealt with perspective and that one with "tactile values," how the Florentines excelled in drawing and the Venetians in color. But for us, not being profes-

sionals, the content of the art is more important than its form. For, after all, the glorious cathedrals of the Middle Ages and the marvellous paintings of the Renaissance were not mere iridescent bubbles blown by or for children with nothing better to do. They were the embodiments of ideas; as the people thought in their hearts so they projected themselves into the objects they created.

The greatest painters the world has seen, and many others who would be greatest in any other time, were contemporaries of Luther. They had a gospel to preach no less sacred to them than was his to him; it was the glad tidings of the kingdom of this world: the splendor, the loveliness, the wonder and the nobility of human life. When, with young eyes, they looked out upon the world in its spring-tide, they found it not the vale of tears that they had been told; they found it a rapture. They saw the naked body not vile but beautiful.

Leonardo da Vinci was a painter of wonder, but not of naïve admiration of things seen. To him the miracle of the world was in the mystery of knowledge,—and he took all nature as his province. He gave his life and his soul for the mastery of science; he observed, he studied, he pondered everything. From the sun in the heavens to the insect on the ground, nothing was so large as to impose upon him, nothing too small to escape him. Weighing, measuring, experimenting, he dug deep for the inner reality of things; he spent years drawing the internal organs of the body, and other years making plans for engineers.

When he painted, there was but one thing that fascinated him: the soul. To lay bare the mind as he had dissected the brain; to take man or woman at some self-revealing pose, to surprise the hidden secret of personality, all this was his passion, and in all this he excelled as no one had ever done, before or since. His battle picture is not some gorgeous and romantic cavalry charge, but a confused *melée* of horses snorting with terror, of men wild with the lust of battle or with hatred or with fear. His portraits are either caricatures or prophecies: they lay bare some trait unsuspected, or they probe some secret weakness. Is not his portrait of himself a

wizard? Does not his Medusa chill us with the horror of death? Is not Beatrice d'Este already doomed to waste away, when he paints her?

The Last Supper had been treated a hundred times before him, now as a eucharistic sacrament, now as a monastic meal, now as a gathering of friends. What did Leonardo make of it? A study of character. Jesus has just said, "One of you will betray me," and his divine head has sunk upon his breast with calm, immortal grief. John, the Beloved, is fairly sick with sorrow; Peter would be fiercely at the traitor's throat; Thomas darts forward, doubting, to ask, "Lord, is it I?" Every face expresses deep and different reaction. There sits Judas, his face tense, the cords of his neck standing out, his muscles taut with the supreme effort not to betray the evil purpose which, nevertheless, lowers on his visage as plainly as a thunder cloud on a sultry afternoon.

Throughout life Leonardo was fascinated with an enigmatic smile that he had seen somewhere, perhaps in Verocchio's studio, perhaps on the face of some woman he had known as a boy. His first paintings were of laughing women, and the same smile is on the lips of John the Baptist and Dionysus and Leda and the Virgin and St. Anne and Mona Lisa! What was he trying to express? Vasari found the "smile so pleasing that it was a thing more divine than human to behold"; Ruskin thought it archaic, Müntz "sad and disillusioned," Berenson supercilious, and Freud neurotic. Raymond calls it the smile of Prometheus, Faust, Oedipus and the Sphinx; Pater saw in it "the animalism of Greece, the lust of Rome, the reverie of the Middle Ages with its spiritual ambitions and imaginary loves, the return to the pagan world, the sins of the Borgias." Though some great critics, like Reinach, have asserted that Mona Lisa is only subtle as any great portrait is subtle, it is impossible to regard it merely as that. It is a psychological study. And what means the smile? In a word, sex,—not on the physical side so studied and glorified by other painters, but in its psychological aspect. For once Leonardo has stripped bare not the body but the soul of desire,—the passion, the lust, the trembling and the shame. There is something frightening

about Leda caught with the swan, about the effeminate Dionysus and John the Baptist's mouth "folded for a kiss of irresistible pleasure." If the stories then told about the children of Alexander VI and about Margaret of Navarre and Anne Boleyn were true, Mona Lisa was their sister.

Everything he touched acquires the same psychological penetration. His Adoration of the Magi is not an effort to delight the eye, but is a study, almost a criticism, of Christianity. All sorts of men are brought before the miraculous Babe, and their reactions, of wonder, of amazement, of devotion, of love, of skepticism, of scoffing, and of indifference, are perfectly recorded.

After the cool and stormy spring of art came the warm and gentle summer. Life became so full, so beautiful, so pleasant, so alluring, that men sought for nothing save to quaff its goblet to the dregs. Venice, seated like a lovely, wanton queen, on her throne of sparkling waters, drew to her bosom all the devotees of pleasure in the whole of Europe. Her argosies still brought to her every pomp and glory of vestment with which to array her body sumptuously; her lovers lavished on her gold and jewels and palaces and rare exotic luxuries. How all this is reflected in her great painters, the Bellinis and Giorgione and Titian and Tintoretto! Life is no longer a wonder to them but a banquet; the malady of thought, the trouble of the soul is not for them. Theirs is the realm of the senses, and if man could live by sense alone, surely he must revel in what they offer. They dye their canvasses in such blaze of color and light as can be seen only in the sunset or in the azure of the Mediterranean, or in tropical flowers. How they clothe their figures in every conceivable splendor of orphrey and ermine, in jewels and shining armor and rich stuff of silk and samite, in robe of scarlet or in yellow dalmatic! Every house for them is a palace, every bit of landscape an enchanted garden, every action an ecstasy, every man a hero and every woman a paragon of voluptuous beauty.

The portrait is one of the most characteristic branches of Renaissance painting, for it appealed to the newly aroused individualism, the grandiose egotism of the so optimistic and



so self-confident age. After Leonardo no one sought to make the portrait primarily a character study. Titian and Raphael and Holbein and most of their contemporaries sought rather to please and flatter than to analyse. But withal there is often a truth to nature that makes many of the portraits of that time like the day of judgment in their revelation of character. Titian's splendid harmonies of scarlet silk and crimson satin and gold brocade and purple velvet and silvery fur enshrine many a blend of villainies and brutal stupidities. What is more cruelly realistic than the leer of the satyr clothed as Francis, King of France; than the bovine dullness of Charles V and the lizard-like dullness of his son; or than that strange combination of wolfish cunning and swinish bestiality with human thought and self-command that fascinates in Raphael's portrait of Leo X and his two cardinals? On the other hand, what a profusion of strong and noble men and women gaze at us from the canvases of that time. They are a study of infinite variety and of surpassing charm.

The secularization of art proceeded even to the length of affecting religious painting. Susanna and Magdalen and St. Barbara and St. Sebastian are no longer starved nuns and monks, bundled in shapeless clothes; they become maidens and youths of marvellous beauty. Even the Virgin and Christ were drawn from the handsomest models obtainable and were richly clothed. This tendency, long at work, found its consummation in Raphael Sanzio of Urbino.

It is one of those useful coincidences that seem almost symbolic that Raphael and Luther were born in the same year, for they were both the products of the same process—the decay of Catholicism. When, for long ages, a forest has rotted on the ground, it may form a bed of coal, ready to be dug up and turned into power, or it may make a field luxuriant in grain and fruit and flowers. From the deposits of medieval religion the miner's son of Mansfeld extracted enough energy to turn half Europe upside down; from the same fertile swamp Raphael culled the most exquisite blossoms and the most delicious berries. To change the metaphor, Luther was the thunder and Raphael the rainbow of the same storm.

The chief work of both of them was to make religion understood of the people; to adapt it to the needs of the time. When faith fails a man may either abandon the old religion for another, or he may stop thinking about dogma altogether and find solace in the mystical-aesthetic aspect of his cult. This second alternative was worked to its limit by Raphael. He was not concerned with the true but with the beautiful. By far the larger part of his very numerous pictures have religious subjects. The whole Bible—which Luther translated into the vernacular—was by him translated into the yet clearer language of sense. Even now most people conceive biblical characters in the forms of this greatest of illustrators. Delicacy, pathos, spirituality, idyllic loveliness—everything but realism or tragedy—are stamped on all his canvases. "Beautiful as a Raphael Madonna" is an Italian proverb, and so skilfully selected a type of beauty is there in his Virgins that they are neither too ethereal nor too sensuous. Divine tenderness, motherhood at its holiest, gazes calmly from the face of the Sistine Madonna, "whose eyes are deeper than the depths of waters stilled at even." The simple mind, unsophisticated by lore of the pre-Raphaelite school, will worship a Raphael when he will but revel in a Titian. Strangely touched by the magic of this passionate lover both of the church and of mortal women, the average man of that day, or of this, found, and will find, glad tidings for his heart in the very color of Mary's robe. "Whoever would know how Christ transfigured and made divine should be painted, must look," says Vasari, on Raphael's canvases.

The church and the papacy found an ally in Raphael, whose pencil illustrated so many triumphs of the popes and so many mysteries of religion. In his *Disputa* (so-called) he made the secret of transubstantiation visible. In his great cartoon of Leo I turning back Attila he gave new power to the arm of Leo X. His *Parnassus* and *School of Athens* seemed to make philosophy easy for the people. Indeed, it is from them that he has reaped his rich reward, for while the Pharisees of art pick flaws in him, point out what they find of shallowness and of insincerity, the people love him more than any other artist has been loved. It is for them

that he worked, and on every labor one might read as it were his motto, "I will not offend even one of these little ones."

If Raphael's art was safe in his own hands there can be little doubt that it hastened the decadence of painting in the hands of his followers. His favorite pupil, Giulio Romano, caught every trick of the master and, like the devil citing Scripture, painted pictures to delight the eye so licentious that they cannot now be exhibited. Andrea del Sarto sentimentalized the Virgin, turning tenderness to bathos. Correggio, the most gifted of them all, could do nothing so well as depict sensual love. His pictures are hymns to Venus, and his women, saints and sinners alike, are houris of an erotic paradise. Has the ecstasy of amorous passion amounting almost to mystical transport ever been better suggested than in the marvellous light and shade of his Jupiter and Io? These and many other contemporary artists had on their lips but one song, a paean in praise of life, the pomps and glories of this goodly world and the delights and beauties of the body.

But to all men, save those loved by the gods, there comes some moment, perhaps in the very heyday of success and joy and love, when a sudden ruin falls upon the world. The death of one loved more than self, disease and pain, the betrayal of some trust, the failure of the so cherished cause—all these and many more are the gates by which tragedy is born. And the beauty of tragedy is above all other beauty because only in some supreme struggle can the grandeur of the human spirit assert its full majesty. In Shakespeare and Michelangelo it is not the torture that pleases us, but the triumph over circumstance.

No one has so deeply felt or so truly expressed this as the Florentine sculptor who, amidst a world of love and laughter, lived in wilful sadness, learning how man from his death-grapple in the darkness can emerge victor and how the soul, by her passion of pain, is perfected. He was interested in but one thing, man, because only man is tragic. He would paint no portraits—or but one or two—because no living person came up to his ideal. All his figures are strong because

strength only is able to suffer as to do. Nine-tenths of them are men rather than women, because the beauty of the male is strength, whereas the strength of the woman is beauty. Only in a few of his early figures does he attain calm,—in a Madonna, in David or in the Men Bathing, all of them, including the Madonna with its figures of men in the background, intended to exhibit the perfection of athletic power.

But save in these early works almost all that Michelangelo set his hand to is fairly convulsed with passion. Leda embraces the swan at the supreme moment of conception; Eve, drawn from the side of Adam, is weeping bitterly; Adam is rousing himself to the hard struggle that is life; the slaves are writhing under their bonds as though they were of hot iron; Moses is starting from his seat for some tremendous conflict. Every figure lavished on the decoration of the Sistine Chapel reaches, when it does not surpass, the limit of human physical development. Sibyl and Prophet, Adam and Eve, man and God are all hurled together with a riot of strength and "terribilità."

The almost supernatural terror of Michelangelo's genius found fullest scope in illustrating the idea of predestination that obsessed the Reformers and haunted many a Catholic of that time also. In the Last Judgment the artist laid the whole emphasis upon the damnation of the wicked, hurled down to external torment by the sentence, "Depart from me, ye cursed," uttered by Christ, not the meek and gentle Man of Sorrows, but the *rex tremendae majestatis*, a Hercules, before whom Mary trembles and the whole of creation shudders. A quieter, but no less tragic work of art is the sculpture on the tomb of Lorenzo de' Medici at Florence. The hero himself sits above, and both he and the four allegorical figures, two men and two women, commonly called Day and Night, Morning and Evening, are lost in pensive, eternal sorrow. So they brood for ever as if seeking in sleep and dumb forgetfulness some anodyne for the sense of their country's and their race's doom.

But it is not all pain. Titian has not made joy nor Raphael love nor Leonardo wonder so beautiful as Michelangelo has made tragedy. His sonnets breathe a worship of beauty as

the symbol of divine love. He is like the great, dark angel of Victor Hugo:

Et l'ange devint noir, et dit:—Je suis l'amour.  
Mais son front sombre était plus charmant que le jour,  
Et je voyais, dans l'ombre où brillaient ses prunelles,  
Les astres à travers les plumes de ses ailes.<sup>6</sup>

The contrast between the fertility of Italian artistic genius and the comparative poverty of Northern Europe is most apparent when the northern painters copied most closely their transalpine brothers. The taste for Italian pictures was spread abroad by the many travelers, and the demand created a supply of copies and imitations. Antwerp became a regular factory of such works, whereas the Germans, Cranach, Dürer and Holbein were profoundly affected by Italy. Of them all Holbein was the only one who could really compete with the Italians on their own ground, and that only in one branch of art, portraiture. His studies of Henry VIII, and of his wives and courtiers, combine truth to nature with a high sense of beauty. His paintings of More and Erasmus express with perfect mastery the finest qualities of two rare natures.

Dürer seldom succeeded in painting pictures of the most beautiful type, but a few of his portraits can be compared with nothing save Leonardo's studies. The whole of a man's life and character are set forth in his two drawings of his friend Pirckheimer, a strange blend of the philosopher and the hog. And the tragedy is that the lower nature won; in 1504 there is but a potential coarseness in the strong face; in 1522 the swine had conquered and but the wreck of the scholar is visible.

As an engineer and as a student of aesthetics Dürer was also the northern Leonardo. His theory of art reveals the secret of his genius: "What beauty is, I know not; but for myself I take that which at all times has been considered

<sup>6</sup> And the angel became black, and said: I am love.  
But his dark forehead was more charming than the day,  
And I saw, in the shadows where his dark eyes shone,  
The stars through the feathers of his wings.



beautiful by the greater number." This is making art democratic, bringing it down from the small coterie of palace and mansion to the home of the people at large. Dürer and his compeers were enabled to do this by exploiting the new German arts of etching and wood-engraving. Pictures were multiplied by hundreds and thousands and sold, not to one patron but to the many. Characteristically they reflected the life and thoughts of the common people in every homely phase. Pious subjects were numerous, because religion bulked large in the common thought, but it was the religion of the popular preacher, translating the life of Christ into contemporary German life, wholesome and a little vulgar. The people love marvels and they are very literal; what could be more marvellous and more literal than Dürer's illustrations of the Apocalypse in which the Dragon with ten horns and seven heads, and the Lamb with seven horns and seven eyes are represented exactly as they are described? Dürer neither strove for nor attained anything but realism. "I think," he wrote, "the more exact and like a man a picture is, the better the work. . . . Others are of another opinion and speak of how a man should be . . . but in such things I consider nature the master and human imaginations errors." It was life he copied, the life he saw around him at Nuremberg.

But Dürer, to use his own famous criterion of portraiture, painted not only the features of Germany, but her soul. Three of his woodcuts depict German aspirations so fully that they are the best explanation of the Reformation, which they prophesy. The first of these, *The Knight, Death and the Devil*, shows the Christian soldier riding through a valley of supernatural terrors. "So ist des Menschen Leben nichts anderes dann eine Ritterschaft auf Erden," is the old German translation of Job vii, 1, following the Vulgate. Erasmus in his *Handbook of the Christian Knight* had imagined just such a scene, and so deeply had the idea of the soldier of Christ sunk into the people's mind that later generations interpreted Dürer's knight as a picture of Sickingen or Hutten or one of the bold champions of the new religion.

In the St. Jerome peacefully at work in his panelled study

translating the Bible, while the blessed sun shines in and the lion and the little bear doze contentedly, is not Luther foretold? But the German study, that magician's laboratory that has produced so much of good, has also often been the alembic of brooding and despair. More than ever before at the opening of the century men felt the vast promises and the vast oppression of thought. New science had burst the old bonds but, withal, the soul still yearned for more. The vanity of knowledge is expressed as nowhere else in Dürer's *Melancholia*, one of the world's greatest pictures. Surrounded by scientific instruments,—the compass, the book, the balance, the hammer, the arithmetical square, the hour-glass, the bell—sits a woman with wings too small to raise her heavy body. Far in the distance is a wonderful city, with the glory of the Northern Lights, but across the splendid vision flits the little bat-like creature, fit symbol of some disordered fancy of an overwrought mind.

Closely akin to the melancholy of the Renaissance is the love of the grewsome. In Dürer it took the harmless form of a fondness for monstrosities,—rhinoceroses, bearded babies, six-legged pigs and the like. But Holbein and many other artists tickled the emotions of their contemporaries by painting long series known as the Dance of Death, in which some man or woman typical of a certain class, such as the emperor, the soldier, the peasant, the bride, is represented as being haled from life by a grinning skeleton.

Typical of the age, too, was the caricature now drawn into the service of the intense party struggles of the Reformation. To depict the pope or Luther or the Huguenots in their true form their enemies drew them with claws and hoofs and ass's heads, and devil's tails, drinking and blaspheming. Even kings were caricatured,—doubly significant fact!

As painting and sculpture attained so high a level of maturity in the sixteenth century, one might suppose that architecture would do the same. In truth, however, architecture rather declined. Very often, if not always, each special art-form goes through a cycle of youth, perfection, and decay, that remind one strongly of the life of a man. The birth of an art is due often to some technical invention, the full

possibilities of which are only gradually developed. But after the newly opened fields have been exhausted the epigoni can do little but recombine, often in fantastic ways, the old elements; public taste turns from them and demands something new.

So the supreme beauty of the medieval cathedral, as seen at Pisa or Florence or Perugia or Rheims or Cologne, was never equalled in the sixteenth century. As the Church declined, so did the churches. Take St. Peter's at Rome, colossal in conception and enormously unequal in execution. With characteristic pride and self-confidence Pope Julius II to make room for it tore down the old church, and other ancient monuments, venerable and beautiful with the hoar of twelve centuries. Even by his contemporaries the architect, Bramante, was dubbed *Ruinante*! He made a plan, which was started; then he died. In his place were appointed San Gallo and Raphael and Michelangelo, together or in turn, and towers were added after the close of the sixteenth century. The result is the hugest building in the world, and almost the worst proportioned. After all, there is something appropriate in the fact that, just as the pretensions of the popes expanded and their powers decreased, so their churches should become vaster and yet less impressive. St. Peter's was intended to be a marble thunderbolt; but like so many of the papal thunders of that age, it was but a *brutum fulmen* in the end!

The love for the grandiose, carried to excess in St. Peter's is visible in other sixteenth century ecclesiastical buildings such as the Badia at Florence. Small as this is, there is a certain largeness of line that is not Gothic, but that goes back to classical models. St. Étienne du Mont at Paris is another good example of the influence of the study of the ancient upon architecture. It is difficult to point to a great cathedral or church built in Germany during this century. In England portions of the colleges at Oxford and Cambridge date from these years, but these portions are grafted on to an older style that really determined them. The greatest glory of English university architecture, the chapel of King's College at Cambridge, was finished in the first years of the century.

The noble fan-vaulting and the stained-glass windows will be remembered by all who have seen them.

After the Reformation ecclesiastical architecture followed two diverse styles; the Protestants cultivated excessive plainness, the Catholics excessive ornament. The iconoclasts had no sense for beauty, and thought, as Luther put it, that faith was likely to be neglected by those who set a high value on external form. Moreover the Protestant services necessitated a modification of the medieval cathedral style. What they wanted was a lecture hall with pews; the old columns and transepts and the roomy floor made way for a **more practical form.**

The Catholics, on the other hand, by a natural reaction, lavished decoration on their churches as never before. Every column was made ornate, every excuse was taken for adding some extraneous embellishment; the walls were crowded with pictures and statues and carving to delight, or at least to arrest, the eye. But it happened that the noble taste of the earlier and simpler age failed; amid all possible devices to give effect, quiet grandeur was wanting.

What the people of that secular generation really built with enthusiasm and success were their own dwellings. What are the castles of Chambord and Blois and the Louvre and Hampton Court and Heidelberg but houses of play and pleasure such as only a child could dream of? King and cardinal and noble vied in making tower and gable, gallery and court as of a fairy palace; banqueting hall and secret chamber where they and their playmates could revel to their heart's content and leave their initials carved as thickly as boys carve them on an old school desk. And how richly they filled them! A host of new arts sprang up to minister to the needs of these palace-dwellers: our museums are still filled with the glass and enamel, the vases and porcelain, the tapestry and furniture and jewelry that belonged to Francis and Catherine de' Medici and Leo X and Elizabeth. How perfect was the art of many of these articles of daily use can only be appreciated by studying at first hand the salt-cellar of Cellini, or the gold and silver and crystal goblets made by his compeers. Examine the clocks, of which

the one at Strassburg is an example; the detail of workmanship is infinite; even the striking apparatus and the dials showing planetary motions are far beyond our own means, or perhaps our taste. When Peter Henlein invented the watch, using as the mainspring a coiled feather, he may not have made chronometers as exact as those turned out nowadays, but the "Nuremberg eggs"—so called from their place of origin and their shape, not a disk, but a sphere—were marvels of chasing and incrustation and jewelry.

The love of the beautiful was universal. The city of that time, less commodious, sanitary, and populous than it is today, was certainly fairer to the eye. Enough of old Nuremberg and Chester and Siena and Perugia and many other towns remains to assure us that the red-tiled houses, the overhanging storeys, the high gables and quaint dormer windows, presented a far more pleasing appearance than do our lines of smoky factories and drab dwellings.

The men so greedy of all delicate sights and pleasant, would fain also stuff their ears with sweet sounds. And so they did, within the limitations of a still undeveloped technique. They had organs, lutes, viols, lyres, harps, citherns, horns, and a kind of primitive piano known as the clavichord or the clavicembalo. Many of these instruments were exquisitely rich and delicate in tone, but they lacked the range and volume and variety of our music. Almost all melodies were slow, solemn, plaintive; the tune of Luther's hymn gives a good idea of the style then prevalent. When we read that the churches adopted the airs of popular songs so that hymns were sung to ale-house jigs and catches from the street, we must remember that the said jigs and love songs were at least as sober and staid as are many of the tunes now expressly written for our hymns. The composers of the time, especially Palestrina and Orlando Lasso, did wonders within the limits then possible to introduce richness and variety into song.

Art was already on the decline when it came into conflict with the religious revivals of the time. The causes of this decadence are not hard to understand. The generation of giants, born in the latter half of the fifteenth century, seemed



to exhaust the possibilities of artistic expression in painting and sculpture, or at least to exhaust the current ideas so expressible. Guido Reni and the Caracci could do nothing but imitate and recombine.

And then came the battle of Protestant and Catholic to turn men's minds into other channels than that of beauty. Even when the Reformation was not consciously opposed to art, it shoved it aside as a distraction from the real business of life. Thus it has come about in Protestant lands that the public regards art as either a "business" or an "education." Luther himself loved music above all things and did much to popularize it,—while Erasmus shuddered at the psalm-singing he heard from Protestant congregations! Of painting the Reformer spoke with admiration, but so rarely! What could art be in the life of a man who was fighting for his soul's salvation? Calvin saw more clearly the dangers to the soul from the seductions of this world's transitory charm. Images he thought idolatrous in churches and he said outright: "It would be a ridiculous and inept imitation of the papists to fancy that we render God more worthy service in ornamenting our temples and in employing organs and toys of that sort. While the people are thus distracted by external things the worship of God is profaned." So it was that the Puritans chased all blandishments not only from church but from life, and art came to be looked upon as a bit immoral.

But the little finger of the reforming pope was thicker than the Puritan's loins; where Calvin had chastised with whips Sixtus V chastised with scorpions. Adrian VI, the first Catholic Reformer after Luther, could not do away with "those idols of the heathen," the ancient statues. Clement VII for a moment restored the old régime of art and licentiousness together, having Perino del Vaga paint his bathroom with scenes from the life of Venus in the manner of Giulio Romano. But the Council of Trent made severe regulations against nude pictures, in pursuance of which Daniel da Volterra was appointed to paint breeches on all the naked figures of Michelangelo's Last Judgment and on similar paintings. Sixtus V, who could hardly endure the Laocoon

and Apollo Belvidere, was bent on destroying the monuments of heathendom. The ruin was complete when to her cruel hate the church added her yet more cruel love. Along came the Jesuits offering, like pedlars, instead of the good old article a substitute guaranteed by them to be "just as good," and a great deal cheaper. Painting was sentimentalized and "moralized" under their tuition; architecture adopted the baroque style, gaudy and insincere. The church was stuffed with gewgaws and tinsel; marble was replaced by painted plaster and saintliness by sickness.

## § 5. Books

The sixteenth was the first really bookish century. There were then in Germany alone about 100,000 works printed, or reprinted. If each edition amounted to 1000—a fair average, for if many editions were smaller, some were much larger—that would mean that about a million volumes were offered to the German public each year throughout the century. There is no doubt that the religious controversy had a great deal to do with the expansion of the reading public, for it had the same effect on the circulation of pamphlets that a political campaign now has on the circulation of the newspaper. The following figures show how rapidly the number of books published in Germany increased during the decisive years. In 1518 there were 150, in 1519 260, in 1520 570, 1521 620, in 1522 680, 1523 935, and 1524 990.

Many of these books were short, controversial tracts; some others were intended as purveyors of news pure and simple. Some of these broadsides were devoted to a single event, as the *Neue Zeitung: Die Schlacht des türkischen Kaisers*; others had several items of interest, including letters from distant parts. Occasionally a mere lampoon would appear under the title of *Neue Zeitung*, corresponding to our funny papers. But these substitutes for modern journals were both rare and irregular; the world then got along with much less information about current events than it now enjoys. No was there anything like our weekly and monthly magazines.

The new age was impatient of medieval literature. Th

schoolmen, never widely read, were widely mocked. The humanists, too, fell into deep disgrace, charged with self-conceit, profligacy and irreligion. They still wandered around, like the sophists in ancient Greece, bemoaning their hard lot and deploring the coarseness of an unappreciative time. Their real fault was that they were, or claimed to be, an aristocracy, and the people, who could read for themselves, no longer were imposed on by pretensions to esoteric learning and a Ciceronian style.

Even the medieval vernacular romances no longer suited the taste of the new generation. A certain class continued to read *Amadis of Gaul* or *La Morte d'Arthur* furtively, but the arbiters of taste declared that they would no longer do. The Puritan found them immoral; the man of the world thought them ridiculous. Ascham asserts that "the whole pleasure" of *La Morte d'Arthur*, "standeth in two special points, in open manslaughter and bold bawdry." The century was hardly out when Cervantes published his famous and deadly satire on the knight errant.

But as the tale of chivalry decayed, the old metal was transmuted into the pure gold of the poetry of Ariosto, Tasso and Spenser. The claim to reality was abandoned and the poet quite frankly conjured up a fantastic, fairy world, full of giants and wizards and enchantments and hippogriffs, and knights of incredible pugnacity who rescue damsels of miraculous beauty. Well might the Italian, before Luther and Loyola came to take the joy out of life, lose himself in the honeyed words and the amorous adventures of the hero who went mad for love. Another generation, and Tasso must wind his voluptuous verses around a religious epic. Edmund Spenser, the Puritan and Englishman, allegorized the whole in such fashion that while the conscience was soothed by knowing that all the knights and ladies represented moral virtues or vices, the senses were titillated by mellifluous cadences and by naked descriptions of the temptations of the Bower of Bliss. And how British that Queen Elizabeth of England should impersonate the principal virtues!

Poetry was in the hearts of the people; song was on their

lips. The early spring of Italy came later to the northern latitudes, but when it did come, it brought with it Marot and Ronsard in France, Wyatt and Surrey in England. More significant than the output of the greater poets was the wide distribution of lyric talent. Not a few compilations of verses offer to the public the songs of many writers, some of them unknown by name. England, especially, was "a nest of singing birds," rapturously greeting the dawn, and the rimes were mostly of "love, whose month is always May." Each songster poured forth his heart in fresh, frank praise of his mistress's beauty, or in chiding of her cruelty, or in lamenting her unfaithfulness. There was something very simple and direct about it all; nothing deeply psychological until at the very end of the century Shakespeare's "sugared sonnets" gave his "private friends" something to think about as well as something to enjoy.

If life could not be all love it could be nearly all laughter. Wit and humor were appreciated above all things, and Satire awoke to a sense of her terrible power. Two statues at Rome, called Pasquino and Marforio, were used as billboards to which the people affixed squibbs and lampoons against the government and public men. Erasmus laughed at everything; Luther and Murner belabored each other with ridicule; a man like Peter Aretino owed his evil eminence in the art of blackmailing to his wit.

But the "master of scoffing," as Bacon far too contemptuously called him, was Rabelais. His laughter is as multitudinous as the ocean billows, and as wholesome as the sunshine. He laughed not because he scorned life but because he loved it; he did not "warm both hands" before the fire of existence, he rollicked before its blaze. It cannot be said that he took a "slice of life" as his subject, for this would imply a more exquisite excision than he would care to make; rather he reached out, in the fashion of his time, and pulled with both hands from the dish before him, the very largest and fattest chunk of life that he could grasp. "You never saw a man," he said of himself, "who would more love to be king or to be rich than I would, so that I could live richly and not work and not worry, and that I might enrich

all my friends and all good, wise people." Like Whitman he was so in love with everything that the mere repetition of common names delighted him. It took pages to tell what Pantagruel ate and still more pages to tell what he drank. This giant dressed with a more than royal lavishness and when he played cards, how many games do you suppose Rabelais enumerated one after the other without pausing to take breath? Two hundred and fourteen! So he treated everything; his appetite was like Gargantua's mouth. This was the very stamp of the age; it was gluttonous of all pleasures, of food and drink and gorgeous clothes and fine dwellings and merry-making without end, and adventure without stint or limit. Almost every sixteenth-century man was a Pantagruel, whose lust for living fully and hotly no satiety could cloy, no fear of consequences dampen. The ascetic gloom and terror of the Middle Ages burned away like an early fog before the summer sun. Men saw the world unfolding before them as if in a second creation, and they hurled themselves on it with but one fear, that they should be too slow or too backward to garner all its wonder and all its pleasure for themselves.

And the people were no longer content to leave the glory of life to their superiors. They saw no reason why all the good things should be preserved like game for the nobles to hunt, or inclosed like commons, for the pasturage of a few aristocratic mutton-heads. So in literature they were quite content to let the fastidious gentry read their fill of poetry about knights wandering in fairy-lands forlorn, while they themselves devoured books about humbler heroes. The picaresque novel in Spain and its counterparts, Till Eulenspiegel or Reinecke Vos in the north, told the adventures of some rascal or vagabond. Living by his wits he found a good life to cheat and to gamble, to drink and to make love.

For those who could not concentrate on a book, there was the drama. From the Middle Ages, when the play was a vehicle of religious instruction, it developed in the period of the Renaissance into a completely secular mirror of life. In Italy there was an exquisite literary drama, turning on



some plot of love or tale of seduction, and there was alongside of this a popular sort of farce known as the *Commedia dell' Arte*, in which only the outline of the plot was sketched, and the characters, usually typical persons as the Lover, his Lady, the Bragging Captain, the Miser, would fill in the dialogue and such comic "business" as tickled the fancy of the audience.

Somewhat akin to these pieces in spirit were the Shrovetide Farces written in Germany by the simple Nuremberger who describes himself in the verses, literally translatable:

Hans Sachs is a shoe-  
Maker and poet, too.

The people, always moral, delighted no less in the rough fun of these artless scenes than in the apothegms and sound advice in which they abounded.

The contrast of two themes much in the thought of men, typifies the spirit of the age. The one motif is loud at the beginning of the Reformation but almost dies away before the end of the century; the other, beginning at the same time, rises slowly into a crescendo culminating far beyond the boundaries of the age. The first theme was the Prodigal Son, treated by no less than twenty-seven German dramatists, not counting several in other languages. To the Protestant, the Younger Son represented faith, the Elder Son works. To all, the exile in the far country, the riotous living with harlots and the feeding on husks with swine, meant the life of this world with its pomps and vanities, its lusts and sinful desires that become as mast to the soul. The return to the father is the return to God's love here below and to everlasting felicity above. To those who can believe it, it is the most beautiful story in the world.

And it is a perfect contrast to that other tale, equally typical of the time, the fable of Faust. Though there was a real man of this name, a charlatan and necromancer who, in his extensive wanderings visited Wittenberg, probably in 1521, and who died about 1536-7, his life was but a peg on which to hang a moral. He became the type of the man

who had sold his soul to the devil in return for the power to know everything, to do everything and to enjoy everything in this world.

The first printed *Faust-book* (1587) passed for three centuries as a Protestant production, but the discovery of an older and quite different form of the legend in 1897 changed the whole literary problem. It has been asserted now that the Faust of this unknown author is a parody of Luther by a Catholic. He is a professor at Wittenberg, he drinks heartily, his marriage with Helena recalls the Catholic caricature of Luther's marriage; his compact with the devil is such as an apostate might have made. But it is truer to say that Faust is not a caricature of Luther, but his devilish counterpart, just as in early Christian literature Simon Magus is the antithesis of Peter. Faust is the man of Satan as Luther was the man of God; their adventures are somewhat similar but with the reverse purpose.

And Faust is the sixteenth century man as truly as the Prodigal or Pantagruel. To live to the full; to know all science and all mysteries, to drain to the dregs the cup crowned with the wine of the pleasure and the pride of life: this was worth more than heaven! The full meaning of the parable of salvation well lost for human experience was not brought out until Goethe took it up; but it is implied both in the German *Faust-books* and in Marlowe's play.

Many twentieth-century men find it difficult to do justice to the age of the Reformation. We are now at the end of the period inaugurated by Columbus and Luther and we have reversed the judgments of their contemporaries. Religion no longer takes the place that it then did, nor does the difference between Catholic and Protestant any longer seem the most important thing in religion. Moreover, capitalism and the state, both of which started on their paths of conquest then, are now attacked.

Again, the application of any statistical method makes the former ages seem to shrink in comparison with the present. In population and wealth, in war and in science we are immeasurably larger than our ancestors. Many a merchant has a bigger income than had Henry VIII, and

many a college boy knows more astronomy than did Kepler. But if we judge the greatness of an age, as we should, not by its distance from us, but by its own achievement, by what its poets dreamed and by what its strong men accomplished, the importance of the sixteenth century can be appreciated.

It was an "experiencing" age. It loved sensation with the greediness of childhood; it intoxicated itself with Rabelais and Titian, with the gold of Peru and with the spices and vestments of the Orient. It was a daring age. Men stood bravely with Luther for spiritual liberty, or they gave their lives with Magellan to compass the earth or with Bruno to span the heavens. It was an age of aspiration. It dreamed with Erasmus of the time when men should be Christlike, or with More of the place where they should be just; or with Michelangelo it pondered the meaning of sorrow, or with Montaigne it stored up daily wisdom. And of this time, bone of its bone and flesh of its flesh, was born the world's supreme poet with an eye to see the deepest and a tongue to tell the most of the human heart. Truly such a generation was not a poor, nor a backward one. Rather it was great in what it achieved, sublime in what it dreamed; abounding in ripe wisdom and in heroic deeds; full of light and of beauty and of life!

## Chapter 5

### The Reformation Interpreted

THE HISTORIANS who have treated the Reformation might be classified in a variety of ways: according to their national or confessional bias, or by their scientific methods or by their literary achievement. For our present purpose it will be convenient to classify them, according to their point of view, into four leading schools of thought which, for want of better names I may call the Religious-Political, the Rationalist, the Liberal-Romantic, and the Economic-Evolutionary. Like all categories of things human these are but rough; many, if not most, historians have been influenced by more than one type of thought. When different philosophies of history prevail at the same time, an eclecticism results. The religious and political explanations were at their height in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, though they survived thereafter; the rationalist critique dominates the eighteenth century and lasts in some instances to the nineteenth; the liberal-romantic school came in with the French revolution and subsided into secondary importance about 1859, when the economists and Darwinians began to assert their claims.

#### 1. The Religious and Political Interpretations. (Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries)

The early Protestant theory of the Reformation was a simple one based on the analogy of Scripture. God, it was thought, had chosen a peculiar people to serve him, for whose instruction and guidance, particularly in view of their habitual backsliding, he raised up a series of witnesses to the truth, prophets, apostles and martyrs. God's care for the Jews under the old dispensation was transferred to the church of the new, and this care was confined to that branch of the true church to which the particular writer and historian happened to belong.

The word "Reformation," far older than the movement to which it applies *par éminence*, indicates exactly what its leaders intended it should be. "Reform" has been one of the perennial watchwords of mankind; in the Middle Ages it was applied to the work of a number of leaders like Rienzi, and was taken as the program of the councils of Constance and Basle. Luther adopted it at least as early as 1518, in a letter to Duke George stating that "above all things a common reformation of the spiritual and temporal estates should be undertaken," and he incorporated it in the title of his greatest German pamphlet. The other name frequently applied by Luther and his friends to their party was "the gospel." In his own eyes the Wittenberg professor was doing nothing more nor less than restoring the long buried evangel of Jesus and Paul. "Luther began," says Richard Burton, "upon a sudden to drive away the foggy mists of superstition and to restore the purity of the primitive church."

It would be easy but superfluous to multiply *ad libitum* quotations showing that the early Protestants referred everything to the general purposes of Providence and sometimes to the direct action of God, or to the impertinent but more assiduous activity of the devil. It is interesting to note that they were not wholly blind to natural causes. Luther himself saw, as early as 1523, the connection between his movement and the revival of learning, which he compared to a John the Baptist preparing the way for the preaching of the gospel. Luther also saw, what many of his followers did not, that the Reformation was no accident, depending on his own personal intervention, but was inevitable and in progress when he began to preach. "The remedy and suppression of abuses," said he in 1529, "was already in full swing before Luther's doctrine arose . . . and it was much to be feared that there would have been a disorderly, stormy, dangerous revolution, such as Münzer began, had not a steady doctrine intervened."

English Protestant historians, while fully adopting the theory of an overruling Providence, were disposed to give due weight to secondary, natural causes. Foxe, while maintaining that the overthrow of the papacy was a great miracle



and an everlasting mercy, yet recognized that it was rendered possible by the invention of printing and by the "first push and assault" given by the ungodly humanists. Burnet followed Foxe's thesis in a much better book. While printing many documents he also was capable, in the interests of piety, of concealing facts damaging to the Protestants. For his panegyric he was thanked by the Parliament. The work was dedicated to Charles II with the flattering and truthful remark that "the first step that was made in the Reformation was the restoring to your royal ancestors the rights of the crown and an entire dominion over all their subjects."

The task of the contemporary German Protestant historian, Seckendorf, was much harder, for the Thirty Years War had, as he confesses, made many people doubt the benefits of the Reformation, distrust its principles, and reject its doctrines. He discharged the thankless labor of apology in a work of enormous erudition, still valuable to the special student for the documents it quotes.

The Catholic philosophy of history was to the Protestant as a seal to the wax, or as a negative to a photograph; what was raised in one was depressed in the other, what was light in one was shade in the other. The same theory of the chosen people, of the direct divine governance and of Satanic meddling, was the foundation of both. That Luther was a bad man, an apostate, begotten by an incubus, and familiar with the devil, went to explain his heresy, and he was commonly compared to Mohammed or Arius. Bad, if often trivial motives were found for his actions, as that he broke away from Rome because he failed to get a papal dispensation to marry. The legend that his protest against indulgences was prompted by the jealousy of the Augustinians toward the Dominicans to whom the pope had committed their sale, was started by Emser in 1519, and has been repeated by Peter Martyr d'Anghiera, by Cochlaeus, by Bossuet and by most Catholic and secular historians down to our own day.

Apart from the revolting polemic of Dr. Sanders, who found the sole cause of the Reformation in sheer depravity, the Catholics produced, prior to 1700, only one noteworthy contribution to the subject, that of Bossuet, Bishop of Meaux.

His *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*, written without that odious defamation of character that had hitherto been the staple of confessional polemic, and with much real eloquence, sets out to condemn the Reformers out of their own mouths by their mutual contradictions. Truth is one, Bossuet maintains, and that which varies is not truth, but the Protestants have almost as many varieties as there are pastors. Never before nor since has such an effective attack been made on Protestantism from the Christian standpoint. With persuasive iteration the moral is driven home: there is nothing certain in a religion without a central authority; revolt is sure to lead to indifference and atheism in opinion, and to the overthrow of all established order in civil life. The chief causes of the Reformation are found in the admitted corruption of the church, and in the personal animosities of the Reformers. The immoral consequences of their theories are alleged, as in Luther's ideas about polygamy and in Zwingli's denial of original sin and his latitudinarian admission of good heathens to heaven.

∇ A great deal that was not much biassed by creed was written on the Reformation during this period. It all goes to show how completely men of the most liberal tendencies were under the influence of their environment, for their comments were almost identical with those of the most convinced partisans. For the most part secular historians neglected ecclesiastical history as a separate discipline. Edward Hall, the typical Protestant chronicler, barely mentions religion. Camden apologizes for touching lightly on church history and not confining himself to politics and war, which he considers the proper subject of the annalist. Buchanan ignores the Reformation; De Thou passes over it with the fewest words, fearing to give offence to either papists or Huguenots. Jovius has only a page or two on it in all his works. In one place he finds the chief cause of the Reformation in a malignant conjunction of the stars; in another he speaks of it as a revival of one of the old heresies condemned at Constance. Polydore Vergil pays small attention to a schism, the cause of which he found in the weakness of men's minds and their propensity to novelty.

The one valuable explanation of the rise of Protestantism contributed by the secular historians of this age was the theory that it was largely a political phenomenon. That there was much truth in this is evident; the danger of the theory was in its over-statement, and in its too superficial application. How deeply the Reformation appealed to the political needs of that age has only been shown in the nineteenth century; how subtly, how unconsciously the two revolutions often worked together was beyond the comprehension of even the best minds of that time. The political explanation that they offered was simply that religion was a hypocritical pretext for the attainment of the selfish ends of monarchs or of a faction. Even in this there was some truth, but it was far from being the larger part.

Vettori in his *History of Italy* mentions Luther merely to show how the emperor used him as a lever against the pope. Guicciardini accounts for the Reformation by the indignation of the Germans at paying money for indulgences. From this beginning, honest or at least excusable in itself, he says, Luther, carried away with ambition and popular applause, nourished a party. The pope might easily have allowed the revolt to die had he neglected it, but he took the wrong course and blew the tiny spark into a great flame by opposing it.

A number of French writers took up the parable. Brantôme says that he leaves the religious issue to those who know more than he does about it, but he considers a change perilous, "for a new religion among a people demands afterwards a change of government." He thought Luther won over a good many of the clergy by allowing them to marry. Martin Du Bellay found the cause of the English schism in Henry's divorce and the small respect the pope had for his majesty. Davila, de Mézeray and Daniel, writing the history of the French civil wars, treated the Huguenots merely as a political party. So they were, but they were something more. Even Hugo Grotius could not sound the deeper causes of the Dutch revolt and of the religious revolution.

The first of all the histories of the German Reformation was also, for at least two centuries, the best. Though sur-

passed in some particulars by others, Sleidan united more of the qualities of a great historian than anyone else who wrote extensively on church history in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries: fairness, accuracy, learning, skill in presentation. In words that recall Ranke's motto he declared that, though a Protestant, he would be impartial and set forth simply "*rem totam, sicut est acta.*" "In describing religious affairs," he continues, "I was not able to omit politics, for, as I said before, they almost always interact, and in our age least of all can they be separated." Withal, he regards the Reformation as a great victory for God's word, and Luther as a notable champion of the true religion. In plain, straightforward narrative, without much philosophic reflection, he sets forth,—none better,—the diplomatic and theological side of the movement without probing its causes or inquiring into the popular support on which all the rest was based.

Greater art and deeper psychological penetration than Sleidan compassed is found in the writings of Paul Sarpi, "the great unmasker of the Tridentine Council," as Milton aptly called him. This friar whose book could only be published on Protestant soil, this historian admired by Macaulay as the best of modern times and denounced by Acton as fit for Newgate prison, has furnished students with one of the most curious of psychological puzzles. Omitting discussion of his learning and accuracy, which have recently been severely attacked and perhaps discredited, let us ask what was his attitude in regard to his subject? It is difficult to place him as either a Protestant, a Catholic apologist or a rationalist. The most probable explanation of his attacks on the creed in which he believed and of his favorable presentation of the acts of the heretics he must have anathematized, is that he was a Catholic reformer, one who ardently desired to purify the church, but who disliked her political entanglements. It is not unnatural to compare him with Adrian VI and Contarini who, in a freer age, had written scathing indictments of their own church; one may also find in Döllinger a parallel to him. Whatever his bias, his limitations are obviously those of his age; his explanations of the Protestant revolt, of which he gave a full history as introductory to



his main subject, were exactly those that had been advanced by his predecessors: it was a divine dispensation, it was caused by the abuses of the church and by the jealousy of Augustinian and Dominican friars.

A brilliant anticipation of the modern economic school of historical thought is found in the *Oceana* of Harrington, who suggested that the causes of the revolution in England were less religious than social. When Henry VIII put the confiscated lands of abbey and noble into the hands of scions of the people, Harrington thought that he had destroyed the ancient balance of power in the constitution, and, while leveling feudalism and the church, had raised up unto the throne an even more dangerous enemy.

## § 2. The Rationalistic Critique. (The Eighteenth Century)

While the "philosophers" of the enlightenment were not the first to judge the Reformation from a secular standpoint, they marked a great advance in historical interpretation as compared with the humanists. The latter had been able to make of the whole movement nothing but either a delusion or a fraud inspired by refined and calculated policy. The philosophers saw deeper into the matter than that; though for them, also, religion was false, originating, as Voltaire put it, when the first knave met the first fool. But they were able to see causes of religious change and to point out instructive analogies.

Montesquieu showed that religions served the needs of their adherents and were thus adapted by them to the prevailing civil organization. After comparing Mohammedanism and Christianity he said that the North of Europe adopted Protestantism because it had the spirit of independence whereas the South, naturally servile, clung to the authoritative Catholic creed. The divisions among Protestants, too, corresponded, he said, to their secular polity; thus Lutheranism became despotic and Calvinism republican because of the circumstances in which each arose. The suppression of church festivals in Protestant countries he thought due to the greater need and zest for labor in the North. He accounted for the alleged fact that Protestantism produced



more free-thinkers by saying that their unadorned cult naturally aroused a less warm attachment than the sensuous ritual of Romanism.

One of the greatest of historians was Voltaire. None other has made history so nearly universal as did he, peering into every side of life and into every corner of the earth. No authority imposed on him, no fact was admitted to be inexplicable by natural laws. It is true that he was not very learned and that he had strong prejudices against what he called "the most infamous superstition that ever brutalized man." But with it all he brought more freedom and life into the story of mankind than had any of his predecessors.

For his history of the Reformation he was dependent on Bossuet, Sarpi, and a few other general works; there is no evidence that he perused any of the sources. But his treatment of the phenomena is wonderful. Beginning with an enthusiastic account of the greatness of the Renaissance, its discoveries, its opulence, its roll of mighty names, he proceeds to compare the Reformation with the two contemporaneous religious revolutions in Mohammedanism, the one in Africa, the other in Persia. He does not probe deeply, but no one else had even thought of looking to comparative religion for light. In tracing the course of events he is more conventional, finding rather small causes for large effects. The whole thing started, he assures us, in a quarrel of Augustinians and Dominicans over the spoils of indulgence-sales, "and this little squabble of monks in a corner of Saxony, produced more than a hundred years of discord, fury, and misfortune for thirty nations." "England separated from the pope because King Henry fell in love." The Swiss revolted because of the painful impression produced by the Jetzer scandal. The Reformation, in Voltaire's opinion, is condemned by its bloodshed and by its appeal to the passions of the mob. The dogmas of the Reformers are considered no whit more rational than those of their opponents, save that Zwingli is praised for "appearing more zealous for freedom than for Christianity. Of course he erred," wittily comments our author, "but how humane it is to err thus!"

The influence of Montesquieu is found in the following early economic interpretation in the *Philosophic Dictionary*:

There are some nations whose religion is the result of neither climate nor government. What cause detached North Germany, Denmark, most of Switzerland, Holland, England, Scotland, and Ireland [sic] from the Roman communion? Poverty. Indulgences . . . were sold too dear. The prelates and monks absorbed the whole revenue of a province. People adopted a cheaper religion.

Of the two Scotch historians that were the most faithful students of Voltaire, one, David Hume, imbibed perfectly his skepticism and scorn for Christianity; the other, William Robertson, everything but that. Presbyterian clergyman as was the latter, he found that the "happy reformation of religion" had produced "a revolution in the sentiments of mankind the greatest as well as the most beneficial that has happened since the publication of Christianity." Such an operation, in his opinion, "historians the least prone to superstition and credulity ascribe to divine Providence." But this Providence worked by natural causes, specially prepared, among which he enumerates: the long schism of the fourteenth century, the pontificates of Alexander VI and Julius II, the immorality and wealth of the clergy together with their immunities and oppressive taxes, the invention of printing, the revival of learning, and, last but not least, the fact that, in the writer's judgment, the doctrines of the papists were repugnant to Scripture. With breadth, power of synthesis, and real judiciousness, he traced the course of the Reformation. He blamed Luther for his violence, but praised him—and here speaks the middle-class advocate of law and order—for his firm stand against the peasants in their revolt.

Inferior to Robertson in the use of sources as well as in the scope of his treatment, Hume was his superior in having completely escaped the spell of the supernatural. His analysis of the nature of ecclesiastical establishments, with which he begins his account of the English Reformation, is acute if

bitter. He shows why it is that, in his view, priests always find it their interest to practice on the credulity and passions of the populace, and to mix error, superstition and delusion even with the deposit of truth. It was therefore incumbent on the civil power to put the church under governmental regulation. This policy, inaugurated at that time and directed against the great evil done to mankind by the church of Rome, in suppressing liberty of thought and in opposing the will of the state, was one cause, though not the largest cause, of the Reformation. Other influences were the invention of printing and the revival of learning and the violent, popular character of Luther and his friends, who appealed not to reason but to the prejudices of the multitude. They secured the support of the masses by fooling them into the belief that they were thinking for themselves, and the support of the government by denouncing doctrines unfavorable to sovereignty. The doctrine of justification by faith, Hume thought, was in harmony with the general law by which religions tend more and more to exaltation of the Deity and to self-abasement of the worshipper. Tory as he was, he judged the effects of the Reformation as at first favorable to the execution of justice and finally dangerous by exciting a restless spirit of opposition to authority. One evil result was that it exalted "those wretched composers of metaphysical polemics, the theologians," to a point of honor that no poet or philosopher had ever attained.

The ablest and fairest estimate of the Reformation found in the eighteenth century is contained in the few pages Edward Gibbon devoted to that subject in his great history of *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*. "A philosopher," he begins, "who calculates the degree of their merit [*i.e.* of Zwingli, Luther and Calvin] will prudently ask from what articles of faith, above or against our reason they have enfranchised the Christians," and, in answering this question he will "rather be surprised at the timidity than scandalized by the freedom of the first Reformers." They adopted the inspired Scriptures with all the miracles, the great mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation, the theology of the four or six first councils, the Athanasian creed with its damnation of

all who did not believe in the Catholic faith. Instead of consulting their reason in the article of transubstantiation, they became entangled in scruples, and so Luther maintained a corporeal and Calvin a real presence in the eucharist. They not only adopted but improved upon and popularized the "stupendous doctrines of original sin, redemption, faith, grace and predestination," to such purpose that "many a sober Christian would rather admit that a wafer is God than that God is a cruel and capricious tyrant." "And yet," Gibbon continues, "the services of Luther and his rivals are solid and important, and the philosopher must own his obligations to these fearless enthusiasts. By their hands the lofty fabric of supersition, from the abuse of indulgences to the intercession of the Virgin, has been levelled with the ground. Myriads of both sexes of the monastic profession have been restored to the liberties and labors of social life." Credulity was no longer nourished on daily miracles of images and relics; a simple worship "the most worthy of man, the least unworthy of the Deity" was substituted for an "imitation of paganism." Finally, the chain of authority was broken and each Christian taught to acknowledge no interpreter of Scripture but his own conscience. This led, rather as a consequence than as a design, to toleration, to indifference and to skepticism.

Wieland, on the other hand, frankly gave the opinion, anticipating Nietzsche, that the Reformation had done harm in retarding the progress of philosophy for centuries. The Italians, he said, might have effected a salutary and rational reform had not Luther interfered and made the people a party to a dispute which should have been left to scholars.

Goethe at one time wrote that Lutherdom had driven quiet culture back, and at another spoke of the Reformation as "a sorry spectacle of boundless confusion, error fighting with error, selfishness with selfishness, the truth only here and there heaving in sight." Again he wrote to a friend: "The character of Luther is the only interesting thing in the Reformation, and the only thing, moreover, that made an impression on the masses. All the rest is a lot of bizarre trash we have not yet, to our cost, cleared away." In the

last years of his long life he changed his opinion somewhat for, if we can trust the report of his conversations with Eckermann, he told his young disciple that people hardly realized how much they owed to Luther who had given them the courage to stand firmly on God's earth.

The treatment of the subject by German Protestants underwent a marked change under the influence of Pietism and the Enlightenment. Just as the earlier Orthodox school had over-emphasized Luther's narrowness, and had been concerned chiefly to prove that the Reformation changed nothing save abuses, so now the leader's liberalism was much over-stressed. It was in view of the earlier Protestant bigotry that Lessing apostrophized the Wittenberg professor: "Luther! thou great, misunderstood man! Thou has freed us from the yoke of tradition, who is to free us from the more unbearable yoke of the letter? Who will finally bring us Christianity such as thou thyself would now teach, such as Christ himself would teach?"

German Robertsons, though hardly equal to the Scotch, were found in Mosheim and Schmidt. Both wrote the history of the Protestant revolution in the endeavor to make it all natural. In Mosheim, indeed, the devil still appears, though in the background; Schmidt is as rational and as fair as any German Protestant could then be.

### § 3. The Liberal-Romantic Appreciation. (Circa 1794—c. 1860)

At about the end of the eighteenth century historiography underwent a profound change due primarily to three influences: 1. The French Revolution and the struggle for political democracy throughout nearly a century after 1789; 2. The Romantic Movement; 3. The rise of the scientific spirit. The judgment of the Reformation changed accordingly; the rather unfavorable verdict of the eighteenth century was completely reversed. Hardly by its extremest partisans in the Protestant camp has the importance of that movement and the character of its leaders been esteemed so highly as it was by the writers of the liberal-romantic school. Indeed, so little had confession to do with this bias that the



finest things about Luther and the most extravagant praise of his work, was uttered not by Protestants, but by the Catholic Döllinger, the Jew Heine, and the free thinkers, Michelet, Carlyle, and Froude.

The French Revolution taught men to see, or misled them into construing, the whole of history as a struggle for liberty against oppression. Naturally, the Reformation was one of the favorite examples of this perpetual warfare; it was the Revolution of the earlier age, and Luther was the great liberator, standing for the Rights of Man against a galling tyranny.

The first to draw the parallel between Reformation and Revolution was Condorcet in his noble essay on *The Advance of the Human Spirit*, written in prison and published posthumously. Luther, said he, punished the crimes of the clergy and freed some peoples from the yoke of the papacy; he would have freed all, save for the false politics of the kings who, feeling instinctively that religious liberty would bring political enfranchisement, banded together against the revolt. He adds that the epoch brought added strength to the government and to political science and that it purified morals by abolishing sacerdotal celibacy; but that it was (like the Revolution, one reads between the lines) soiled by great atrocities.

In the year 1802, the Institute of France announced as the subject for a prize competition, "What has been the influence of the Reformation of Luther on the political situation of the several states of Europe and on the progress of enlightenment?" The prize was won by Charles de Villers in an essay maintaining elaborately the thesis that the gradual improvement of the human species has been effected by a series of revolutions, partly silent, partly violent, and that the object of all these risings has been the attainment of either religious or of civil liberty. After arguing his position in respect to the Reformation, the author eulogizes it for having established religious freedom, promoted civil liberty, and for having endowed Europe with a variety of blessings, including almost everything he liked. Thus, in his opinion, the Reformation made Protestant countries more wealthy by

keeping the papal tax-gatherers aloof; it started "that grand idea the balance of power," and it prepared the way for a general philosophical enlightenment.

The thesis of Villers is exactly that maintained, with more learning and caution, by Guizot. According to him:

The Reformation was a vast effort made by the human race to secure its freedom; it was a new-born desire to think and judge freely and independently of all ideas and opinions, which until then Europe had received or been bound to receive from the hands of antiquity. It was a great endeavor to emancipate the human reason and to call things by their right names. It was an insurrection of the human mind against the absolute power of the spiritual estate.

But there was more than politics to draw the sympathies of the nineteenth century to the sixteenth. A large anthology of poetical, artistic and musical tributes to Luther and the Reformation might be made to show how congenial they were to the spirit of that time. One need only mention Werner's drama on the subject of Luther's life (1805), Mendelssohn's "Reformation Symphony" (1832-3), Meyerbeer's opera "The Huguenots" (1836), and Kaulbach's painting "The Age of the Reformation" (c. 1840). In fact the Reformation was a Romantic movement, with its emotional and mystical piety, its endeavor to transcend the limits of the classic spirit, to search for the infinite, to scorn the trammels of traditional order and method.

All this is reflected in Mme. de Staël's enthusiastic appreciation of Protestant Germany, in which she found a people characterized by reflectiveness, idealism, and energy of inner conviction. She contrasted Luther's revolution of ideas with her own countrymen's revolution of acts, practical if not materialistic. The German had brought back religion from an affair of politics to be a matter of life; had transferred it from the realm of calculated interest to that of heart and brain.

Much the same ideas, set forth with the most dazzling

brilliancy of style, animate Heine's too much neglected sketch of German religion and philosophy. To a French public, unappreciative of German literature, Heine points out that the place taken in France by *belles lettres* is taken east of the Rhine by metaphysics. From Luther to Kant there is one continuous development of thought, and no less than two revolutions in spiritual values. Luther was the sword and tongue of his time; the tempest that shattered the old oaks of hoary tyranny; his hymn was the Marseillaise of the spirit; he made a revolution and not with roseleaves, either, but with a certain "divine brutality." He gave his people language, Kant gave them thought; Luther deposed the pope; Robespierre decapitated the king; Kant disposed of God: it was all one insurrection of Man against the same tyrant under different names.

Under the triple influence of liberalism, romanticism and the scientific impulse presently to be described, most of the great historians of the middle nineteenth century wrote. If not the greatest, yet the most lovable of them all, was Jules Michelet, a free-thinker of Huguenot ancestry. His *History of France* is like the biography of some loved and worshipped genius; he agonizes in her trials, he glories in her triumphs. And to all great men, her own and others, he puts but one inexorable question, "What did you do for the people?" and according to their answer they stand or fall before him. It is just here that one notices (what entirely escaped previous generations), that the "people" here means that part of it now called, in current cant, "the bourgeoisie," that educated middle class with some small property and with the vote. For the ignorant laborer and the pauper Michelet had as little concern as he had small patience with king and noble and priest. One thing that he and his contemporaries prized in Luther was just that bourgeois virtue that made him a model husband and father, faithfully performing a daily task for an adequate reward. Luther's joys, he assures us, were "those of the heart, of the man, the innocent happiness of family and home. What family more holy, what home more pure?" But he returns ever and again to the thought that the Huguenots were the republicans of

their age and that, "Luther has been the restorer of liberty. If now we exercise in all its fullness this highest prerogative of human intelligence, it is to him we are indebted for it. To whom do I owe the power of publishing what I am now writing, save to this liberator of modern thought?" Michelet employed his almost matchless rhetoric not only to exalt the Reformers to the highest pinnacle of greatness, but to blacken the character of their adversaries, the obscurantists, the Jesuits, Catherine de' Medici.

English liberalism found its perfect expression in the work of Froude. Built up on painstaking research, readable as a novel, cut exactly to the prejudices of the English Protestant middle class, *The History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Defeat of the Spanish Armada* won a resounding immediate success. Froude loved Protestantism for the enemies it made, and as a mild kind of rationalism. The Reformers, he thought, triumphed because they were armed with the truth; it was a revolt of conscience against lies, a real religion over against "a superstition which was but the counterpart of magic and witchcraft" and which, at that time, "meant the stake, the rack, the gibbet, the Inquisition dungeons and the devil enthroned." It was the different choice made then by England and Spain that accounted for the greatness of the former and the downfall of the latter, for, after the Spaniard, once "the noblest, grandest and most enlightened people in the known world," had chosen for the saints and the Inquisition, "his intellect shrivelled in his brain and the sinews shrank in his self-bandaged limbs."

Practically the same type of opinion is found in the whole school of middle-century historians. "Our firm belief is," wrote Macaulay, "that the North owes its great civilization and prosperity chiefly to the moral effect of the Protestant Reformation, and that the decay of the Southern countries is to be mainly ascribed to the great Catholic revival." It would be pleasant, were there space, to quote similar enthusiastic appreciations from the French scholars Quinet and Thierry, the Englishman Herbert Spencer and the Americans Motley and Prescott. They all regarded the Reformation as at once an enlightenment and enfranchisement. Even

the philosophers rushed into the same camp. Carlyle worshipped Luther as a hero; Emerson said that his "religious movement was the foundation of so much intellectual life in Europe; that is, Luther's conscience animating sympathetically the conscience of millions, the pulse passed into thought, and ultimated itself in Galileos, Keplers, Swedenborgs, Newtons, Shakespeares, Bacons and Miltons." Back of all this appreciation was a strong unconscious sympathy between the age of the Reformation and that of Victoria. The creations of the one, Protestantism, the national state, capitalism, individualism, reached their perfect maturity in the other. The very moderate liberals of the latter found in the former just that "safe and sane" spirit of reform which they could thoroughly approve.

The enthusiasm generated by political democracy in France, England and America, was supplemented in Germany by patriotism. Herder first emphasized Luther's love of country as his great virtue; Arndt, in the Napoleonic wars, counted it unto him for righteousness that he hated Italian craft and dreaded French deceitfulness. Fichte, at the same time, in his fervent *Speeches to the German Nation*, called the Reformation "the consummate achievement of the German people," and its "perfect act of world-wide significance." Freytag, at a later period, tried to educate the public to search for a German state at once national and liberal. In his *Pictures from the German Past*, largely painted from sixteenth-century models, he places all the high-lights on "Deutschtum" and "Blürgertum," and all the shade on the foreigners and the Junkers. With Freytag as a German liberal may be classed D. F. Strauss, who defended the Reformers for choosing, rather than superficial culture, "the better part," "the one thing needful," which was truth.

It is now high time to say something of the third great influence that, early in the nineteenth century, transformed historiography. It was the rise of the scientific spirit, of the fruitful conception of a world lapped in universal law. For two centuries men had gradually become accustomed to the thought of an external nature governed by an unbreakable chain of cause and effect, but it was still believed that man,



with his free will, was an exception and that history, therefore, consisting of the sum total of humanity's arbitrary actions, was incalculable and in large part inexplicable. But the more closely men studied the past, and the more widely and deeply did the uniformity of nature soak into their consciousness, the more "natural" did the progress of the human race seem. When it was found that every age had its own temper and point of view, that men turned with one accord in the same direction as if set by a current, long before any great man had come to create the current, the influence of personality seemed to sink into the background, and that of other influences to be preponderant.

Quite inevitably the first natural and important philosophy of history took a semi-theological, semi-personal form. The philosopher Hegel, pondering on the fact that each age has its own unmistakable "time-spirit" and that each age is a natural, even logical, development of some antecedent, announced the Doctrine of Ideas as the governing forces in human progress. History was but the development of spirit, or the realization of its idea; and its fundamental law was the necessary "progress in the consciousness of freedom." The Oriental knew that one is free, the Greek that some are free, the Germans that all are free. In this third, or Teutonic, stage of evolution, the Reformation was one of the longest steps. The characteristic of modern times is that the spirit is conscious of its own freedom and wills the true, the eternal and the universal. The dawn of this period, after the long and terrible night of the Middle Ages, is the Renaissance, its sunrise the Reformation. In order to prove his thesis, Hegel labors to show that the cause of the Protestant revolt in the corruption of the church was not accidental but necessary, inasmuch as, at the Catholic stage of progress, that which is adored must necessarily be sensuous, but at the lofty German level the worshipper must look for God in the spirit and heart, that is, in faith. The subjectivism of Luther is due to German sincerity manifesting the self-consciousness of the world-spirit; his doctrine of the eucharist, conservative as it seems to the rationalist, is in reality a manifestation of the same spirituality, in the assertion of an im-

mediate relation of Christ to the soul. In short, the essence of the Reformation is said to be that man in his very nature is destined to be free, and all history since Luther's time is but a working out of the implications of his position. If only the Germanic nations have adopted Protestantism, it is because only they have reached the highest state of spiritual development.

The philosopher's truest disciple was Ferdinand Christian Baur, of whom it has been said that he rather deduced history than narrated it. With much detail he filled in the outline offered by the master, in as far as the subject of church history was concerned. He showed that the Reformation (a term to which he objected, apparently preferring Division, or Schism) was bound to come from antecedents already in full operation before Luther. At most, he admitted, the personal factor was decisive of the time and place of the inevitable revolution, but said that the most powerful personality would have been helpless but for the popularity of the ideas expressed by him. Like Hegel, he deduced the causes of the movement from the corruption of the medieval church, and like him he regarded all later history as but the tide of which the first wave broke in 1517. The true principle of the movement, religious autonomy and subjective freedom, he believed, had been achieved only for states in the sixteenth century, but thereafter logically and necessarily came to be applied to individuals.

From the Hegelian school came forth the best equipped historian the world has ever seen. Save the highest quality of thought and emotion that is the prerogative of poetic genius, Leopold von Ranke lacked nothing of industry, of learning, of method and of talent to make him the perfect narrator of the past. It was his idea to pursue history for no purpose but its own; to tell "exactly what happened" without regard to the moral, or theological, or political lesson. Thinking the most colorless presentation the best, he seldom allowed his own opinions to appear. In treating the Reformation he was "first an historian and then a Christian." There is in his work little biography, and that little psychological; there is no dogma and no polemic. From Hegel he derived

his belief in the "spirit" of the times, and nicely differentiated that of the Renaissance, the Reformation and the Counter-reformation. He was the first to generalize the use of the word "Counter-reformation"—coined in 1770 and obtaining currency later on the analogy of "counter-revolution." The causes of the Reformation Ranke found in "deeper religious and moral repugnance to the disorders of a merely assenting faith and service of 'works,' and, secondarily, in the assertion of the rights and duties residing in the state." Quite rightly, he emphasized the result of the movement in breaking down the political power of the ecclesiastical state, and establishing in its stead "a completely autonomous state sovereignty, bound by no extraneous considerations and existing for itself alone." Of all the ideas which have aided in the development of modern Europe he esteemed this the most effective. Would he have thought so after 1919?

A new start in the search for fixed historical laws was made by Henry Thomas Buckle. His point of departure was not, like that of Hegel, the universal, but rather certain very particular sociological facts as interpreted by Comte's positivism. Because the same percentage of unaddressed letters is mailed every year, because crimes vary in a constant curve according to season, because the number of suicides and of marriages stands in a fixed ratio to the cost of bread, Buckle argued that all human acts, at least in the mass, must be calculable, and reducible to general laws. At present we are concerned only with his views on the Reformation. The religious opinions prevalent at any period, he pointed out, are but symptoms of the general culture of that age. Protestantism was to Catholicism simply as the moderate enlightenment of the sixteenth century was to the darkness of the earlier centuries. Credulity and ignorance were still common, though diminishing, in Luther's time, and this intellectual change was the cause of the religious change. Buckle makes one strange and damaging admission, namely that though, according to his theory, or, as he puts it, "according to the natural order," the "most civilized countries should be Protestant and the most uncivilized Catholic [sic]," it has not always been so. In general Buckle adopts the theory of the

Reformation as an uprising of the human mind, an enlightenment, and a democratic rebellion.

Whereas Henry Hallam, who wrote on the relation of the Reformers to modern thought, is a belated eighteenth-century rationalist, doubtless Lecky is best classified as a member of the new school. His *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism* is partly Hegelian, partly inspired by Buckle. His main object is to show how little reason has to do with the adoption or rejection of any theology, and how much it is dependent on a certain spirit of the age, determined by quite other causes. He found the essence of the Reformation in its conformity to then prevalent habits of mind and morals. But he thought it had done more than any other movement to emancipate the mind from superstition and to secularize society.

It is impossible to do more than mention by name, in the short space at my command, the principal Protestant apologists for the Reformation, in this period. Whereas Ritschl gave a somewhat new aspect to the old "truths," Merle d'Aubigné won an enormous and unmerited success by reviving the supernatural theory of the Protestant revolution, with such modern connotations and modifications as suited the still lively prejudices of the evangelical public of England and America; for it was in these countries that his book, in translation from the French, won its enormous circulation.<sup>1</sup>

An extremely able adverse judgment of the Reformation was expressed by the Catholic Döllinger, the most theological of historians, the most historically-minded of divines. He, too, thought Luther had really founded a new religion, of which the center was the mystical doctrine, tending to solipsism, of justification by faith. The very fact that he said much good of Luther, and approved of many of his practical reforms, made his protest the more effective. It is noticeable that when he broke with Rome he did not become a Protestant.

The preface of the English edition of 1848 claims that whereas, since 1835, only 4000 copies were sold in France, between 150,000 and 200,000 were sold in England and America.

#### § 4. The Economic and Evolutionary Interpretations. (1859 to the Present)

The year 1859 saw the launching of two new theories of the utmost importance. These, together with the political developments of the next twelve years, completely altered the view-point of the intellectual class, as well as of the peoples. In relation to the subject under discussion this meant a reversal of historical judgment as radical as that which occurred at the time of the French Revolution. The three new influences, in the order of their immediate importance for historiography, were the following: 1. The publication of Marx's *Zur Kritik der politischen Ökonomie* in 1859, containing the germ of the economic interpretation of history later developed in *Das Kapital* (1867) and in other works. 2. The publication of Darwin's *Origin of Species*, giving rise to an evolutionary treatment of history. 3. The Bismarckian wars (1864-71), followed by German intellectual and material hegemony, and the defeat of the old liberalism. This lasted only until the Great War (1914-18), when Germany was cast down and liberalism rose in more radical guise than ever.

Karl Marx not only viewed history for the first time from the point of view of the proletariat, or working class, but he directly asserted that in the march of mankind the economic factors had always been, in the last analysis, decisive; that the material basis of life, particularly the system of production, determined, in general, the social, political and religious ideas of every epoch and of every locality. Revolutions follow as the necessary consequence of economic change. In the scramble for sustenance and wealth class war is postulated as natural and ceaseless. The old Hegelian antithesis of idea versus personality took the new form of "the masses" versus "the great man," both of whom were but puppets in the hands of overmastering determinism. As often interpreted, Marx's theory replaced the Hegelian "spirits of the time" by the classes, conceived as entities struggling for mastery.

This brilliant theory suffered at first in its application



which was often hasty, or fantastic. As the economic factor had once been completely ignored, so now it was over-worked. Its major premise of an "economic man," all greed and calculation, is obviously false, or rather, only half true. Men's motives are mixed, and so are those of aggregates of men. There are other elements in progress besides the economic ones. The only effective criticism of the theory of economic determination is that well expressed by Dr. Shailer Mathews, that it is too simple. Self-interest is one factor in history, but not the only one.

Exception can be more justly taken to the way in which the theory has sometimes been applied than to its formulation. Belfort Bax, maintaining that the revolt from Rome was largely economic in its causes, gave as one of these "the hatred of the ecclesiastical hierarchy, obviously due to its increasing exactions." Luther would have produced no result had not the economic soil been ready for his seed, and with that soil prepared he achieved a world-historical result even though, in Bax's opinion, his character and intellect were below those of the average English village grocer-deacon who sold sand for sugar. Luther, in fact, did no more than give a flag to those discontented with the existing political and industrial life. Strange to say, Bax found even the most radical party, that of the communistic Anabaptists, retrograde, with its program of return to a golden age of **gild and common land.**

A somewhat better grounded, but still adequate, solution of the problem was offered by Karl Kautsky. He, too, found the chief cause of the revolt in the spoliation of Germany by Rome. In addition to this was the new rivalry of commercial classes. Unlike Bax, Kautsky finds in the Anabaptists Socialists of whom he can thoroughly approve.

The criticism that must be made of these and similar attempts, is that the causes picked out by them are too trivial. To say that the men who, by the thousands and tens of thousands suffered martyrdom for their faith, changed that faith simply because they objected to pay a tithe, reminds one of the ancient Catholic derivation of the whole movement from Luther's desire to marry. The effect is out of

proportion to the cause. But some theorists were even more fantastic than trivial. When Professor S. N. Patten traces the origins of revolutions to either over-nutrition or under-nutrition, and that of the Reformation to "the growth of frugalistic concepts"; when Mr. Brooks Adams asserts that it was all due to the desire of the people for a cheaper religion, exchanging an expensive offering for justification by faith and mental anguish, which cost nothing, and an expensive church for a cheap Bible—we feel that the dish of theory has run away with the spoon of fact. The climax was capped by the German sociologist Friedrich Simmel, who explained the Reformation by the law of the operation of force along the line of least resistance. The Reformers, by sending the soul straight to God, spared it the detour via the priest, thus short-circuiting grace, as it were, and saving energy.

The genius who first and most fully worked out a tenable economic interpretation of the Lutheran movement was Karl Lamprecht, who stands in much the same relation to Marx as did Ranke to Hegel, to wit, that of an independent, eclectic and better informed student. Lamprecht, as it is well known, divides history into periods according to their psychological character—perhaps an up-to-date Hegelianism—but he maintains, and on the whole successfully, that the temper of each of these epochs is determined by their economic institutions. Thus, says he, the condition of the transition from medieval to modern times was the development of a system of "money economy" from a system of "natural economy," which took place slowly throughout the 14th, 15th, 16th, and 17th centuries. "The complete emergence of capitalistic tendencies, with their consequent effects on the social, and, chiefly through this, on the intellectual sphere, must of itself bring on modern times." Lamprecht shows how the rise of capitalism was followed by the growth of the cities and of the culture of the Renaissance in them, and how, also, individualism arose in large part as a natural consequence of the increased power and scope given to the ego by the possession of wealth. This individualism, he thinks, strengthened by and strengthening humanism, was made forever safe by the Reformation.

It is a momentous error, as Lamprecht rightly points out, to suppose that we are living in the same era of civilization, psychologically considered, as that of Luther. Our subjectivism is as different from his individualism as his modernity was from medievalism. The eighteenth century was a transitional period from the one to the other.

One of the chief characteristics of the Reformation, continues Lamprecht, seen first in the earlier mystics, was the change from "polydynamism," or the worship of many saints, and the mediation of manifold religious agencies, to "monodynamism" or the direct and single intercourse of the soul with God. Still more different was the world-view of the nineteenth century, built on "an extra-Christian, though not yet anti-Christian foundation."

In the very same year in which Lamprecht's volume on the German Reformation appeared, another interpretation, though less profound and less in the economic school of thought, was put forth by A. E. Berger. He found the four principal causes of the Reformation in the growth of national self-consciousness, the overthrow of an ascetic for a secular culture, individualism, and the growth of a lay religion. The Reformation itself was a triumph of conscience and of "German inwardness," and its success was due to the fact that it made of the church a purely spiritual entity.

The most brilliant essay in the economic interpretation of the origins of Protestantism, though an essay in a very narrow field, was that of Max Weber which has made "Capitalism and Calvinism" one of the watchwords of contemporary thought. The intimate connection of the Reformation and the merchant class had long been noticed, *e. g.* by Froude and by Thorold Rogers. But Weber was the first to ask, and to answer, the question what it was that made Protestantism particularly congenial to the industrial type of civilization. In the first place, Calvinism stimulated just those ethical qualities of rugged strength and self-confidence needful for worldly success. In the second place, Protestantism abolished the old ascetic ideal of labor for the sake of the next world, and substituted for it the conception of a calling, that is, of doing faithfully the work appointed to each man in this

world. Indeed, the word "calling" or "Beruf," meaning God-given work, is found only in Germanic languages, and is wanting in all those of the Latin group. The ethical idea expressed by Luther and more strongly by Calvin was that of faithfully performing the daily task; in fact, such labor was inculcated as a duty to the point of pain; in other words it was "a worldly asceticism." Finally, Calvin looked upon thrift as a duty, and regarded prosperity, in the Old Testament style, as a sign of God's favor. "You may labor in that manner as tendeth most to your success and lawful gain," said the Protestant divine Richard Baxter, "for you are bound to improve all your talents." And again, "If God show you a way in which you may lawfully get more than in another way, if you refuse this and choose the less gainful way, you cross one of the ends of your calling, and you refuse to be God's steward."

It would be instructive and delightful to follow the controversy caused by Weber's thesis. Some scholars, like Knodt, denied its validity, tracing capitalism back to the spirit of Fugger rather than of Calvin; but most accepted it. Fine interpretations and criticisms of it were offered by Cunningham, Brentano, Kovalewsky and Ashley. So commonly has it been received that it has finally been summed up in a brilliant but superficial epigram used by Chesterton, good enough to have been coined by him—though it is not, I believe, from his mint—that the Reformation was "the Revolution of the rich against the poor."

Contemporary with the economic historiography, there was a new intellectual criticism reminding one superficially of the Voltairean, but in reality founded far more on Darwinian ideas. The older "philosophers" had blamed the Reformers for not coming up to a modern standard; the new evolutionists censured them for falling below the standard of their own age. Moreover, the critique of the new atheism was more searching than had been that of the old deism.

Until Nietzsche, the prevailing view had been that the Reformation was the child, or sister, of the Renaissance, and the parent of the Enlightenment and the French Revolution. "We are in the midst of a gigantic movement," wrote Hux-

ley, "greater than that which preceded and produced the Reformation, and really only a continuation of that movement." "The Reformation," in the opinion of Tolstoy, "was a rude, incidental reflection of the labor of thought, striving after the liberation of man from the darkness." "The truth is," according to Symonds, "that the Reformation was the Teutonic Renaissance. It was the emancipation of the reason on a line neglected by the Italians, more important, indeed, in its political consequences, more weighty in its bearing on rationalistic developments than was the Italian Renaissance, but none the less an outcome of the same grand influence." William Dilthey, in the nineties, labored to show that the essence of the Reformation was the same in the religious fields as that of the best thought contemporary to it in other lines.

But these ideas were already obsolescent since Friedrich Nietzsche had worked out, with some care, the thought that "the Reformation was a re-action of old-fashioned minds, against the Italian Renaissance." One might suppose that this furious Antichrist, as he wished to be, would have thought well of Luther because of his opinion that the Saxon first taught the Germans to be unchristian, and because "Luther's merit is greater in nothing than that he had the courage of his sensuality—then called, gently enough, 'evangelic liberty.'" But no! With frantic passion Nietzsche charged: "The Reformation, a duplication of the medieval spirit at a time when this spirit no longer had a good conscience, pulled sects, and superstitions like the witchcraft craze." German culture was just ready to burst into full bloom, only one night more was needed, but that night brought the storm that ruined all. The Reformation was the peasants' revolt of the human spirit, a rising full of sound and fury, but signifying nothing. It was "the rage of the simple against the complex, a rough, honest misunderstanding, in which (to speak mildly) much must be forgiven." Luther unraveled and tore apart a culture he did not appreciate and an authority he did not relish. Behind the formula "every man his own priest" lurked nothing but the abysmal hatred of the low for the higher; the truly plebeian spirit at its worst.



Quite slowly but surely Nietzsche's opinion gained ground until one may say that it was, not long ago, generally accepted. "Our sympathies are more in unison, our reason less shocked by the arguments and doctrines of Sadolet than by those of Calvin," wrote R. C. Christie. Andrew D. White's popular study of *The Warfare of Science and Theology* proved that Protestant churches had been no less hostile to intellectual progress than had the Catholic church. "The Reformation, in fact," opined J. M. Robertson, "speedily overclouded with fanaticism what new light of free thought had been glimmering before, turning into Bibliolaters those who had rationally doubted some of the Catholic mysteries and forcing back into Catholic bigotry those more refined spirits who, like Sir Thomas More, had been in advance of their age." "Before the Lutheran revolt," said Henry C. Lea, "much freedom of thought and speech was allowed in Catholic Europe, but not after." Similar opinions might be collected in large number; I mention only the works of Bezold and the brief but admirably expressed articles of Professor George L. Burr, and that of Lemonnier, who places in a strong light the battle of the Renaissance, intellectual, indifferent in religion and politics, but aristocratic in temper, and the Reformation, reactionary, religious, preoccupied with medieval questions and turning, in its hostility to the governing orders, to popular politics.

The reaction of the Reformation on religion was noticed by the critics, who thus came to agree with the conservative estimate, though they deplored what the others had rejoiced in. Long before Nietzsche, J. Burckhardt had pointed out that the greatest danger to the papacy, secularization, had been adjourned for centuries by the German Reformation. It was this that roused the papacy from the soulless debasement in which it lay; it was thus that the moral salvation of the papacy was due to its mortal enemies.

The twentieth century has seen two brilliant critiques of the Reformation from the intellectual side by scholars of consummate ability, Ernst Troeltsch and George Santayana. The former begins by pointing out, with a fineness never surpassed, the essential oneness and slight differences between

early Protestantism and Catholicism. The Reformers asked the same questions as did the medieval schoolmen and, though they gave these questions somewhat different answers, their minds, like those of other men, revealed themselves far more characteristically in the asking than in the reply. "Genuine early Protestantism . . . was an authoritative ecclesiastical civilization (*kirchliche Zwangskultur*), a claim to regulate state and society, science and education, law, commerce, and industry, according to the supernatural standpoint of revelation." The Reformers separated early and with cruel violence from the humanistic, philological, and philosophical theology of Erasmus because they were conscious of an essential opposition. Luther's sole concern was with assurance of salvation, and this could only be won at the cost of a miracle, not any longer the old, outward magic of saints and priestcraft, but the wonder of faith occurring in the inmost center of personal life. "The sensuous sacramental miracle is done away, and in its stead appears the miracle of faith, that man, in his sin and weakness, can grasp and confidently assent to such a thought." Thus it came about that the way of salvation became more important than the goal, and the tyranny of dogma became at last unbearable. Troeltsch characterizes both his own position and that of the Reformers when he enumerates among the ancient dogmas taken over naïvely by Luther, that of the existence of a personal, ethical God. Finely contrasting the ideals of Renaissance and Reformation, he shows that the former was naturalism, the latter an intensification of religion and of a convinced other-worldiness, that while the ethic of the former was based on "affirmation of life," that of the latter was based on "calling." Even as compared with Catholicism, Troeltsch thinks, supererogatory works were abolished because each Protestant Christian was bound to exert himself to the utmost at all times. The learned professor hazards the further opinion that the spirit of the Renaissance amalgamated better with Catholicism and, after a period of quiescence, burst forth in the "frightful explosion" of the Enlightenment and Revolution, both more radical in Catholic countries than in Protestant. But Troeltsch is too historically-minded to see in the Refor-

mation only a reaction. He believes that it contributed to the formation of the modern world by the development of nationalism, individualism (qualified by the objectively conceived sanction of Bible and Christian community), moral health, and, indirectly, by the introduction of the ideas of tolerance, criticism, and religious progress. Moreover, it enriched the world with the story of great personalities. Protestantism was better able to absorb modern elements of political, social, scientific, artistic and economic content, not because it was professedly more open to them, but because it was weakened by the memory of one great revolt from authority. But the great change in religion as in other matters came, Troeltsch is fully convinced, in the eighteenth century.

If Troeltsch has the head of a skeptic with the heart of a Protestant, Santayana's equally irreligious brain is biased by a sentimental sympathy for the Catholicism in which he was trained. The essence of his criticism of Luther, than whom, he once scornfully remarked, no one could be more unintelligent, is that he moved away from the ideal of the gospel. Saint Francis, like Jesus, was unworldly, disenchanted, ascetic; Protestantism is remote from this spirit, for it is convinced of the importance of success and prosperity, abominates the disreputable, thinks of contemplation as idleness, of solitude as selfishness, of poverty as a punishment, and of married and industrial life as typically godly. In short, it is a reversion to German heathendom. But Santayana denies that Luther prevented the euthanasia of Christianity, for there would have been, he affirms, a Catholic revival without him. With all its old-fashioned insistence that dogma was scientifically true and that salvation was urgent and fearfully doubtful, Protestantism broke down the authority of Christianity, for "it is suicidal to make one part of an organic system the instrument for attacking the other part." It is the beauty and torment of Protestantism that it leads to something ever beyond its ken, finally landing its adherent in a pious skepticism. Under the solvent of self-criticism German religion and philosophy have dropped, one by one, all supernaturalism and comforting private hopes and have become absorbed in the duty of living manfully the conven-

tional life of the world. Positive religion and frivolity both disappear, and only "consecrated worldliness" remains.

Some support to the old idea that the Reformation was a progressive movement has been recently offered by eminent scholars. G. Monod says that the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism is that the former created a closed philosophy, the latter left much open. "The Reformation," according to H. A. L. Fisher, "was the great dissolvent of European conservatism. A religion which had been accepted with little question for 1200 years, which had dominated European thought, moulded European customs, shaped no small part of private law and public policy . . . was suddenly and sharply questioned in all the progressive communities of the West."

Bertrand Russell thinks that, while the Renaissance undermined the medieval theory of authority in a few choice minds, the Reformation made the first really serious breach in that theory. It is just because the fight for liberty (which he hardly differentiates from anarchism) began in the religious field, that its triumph is now most complete in that field. We are still bound politically and economically; that we are free religiously is due to Luther. It is an evil, however, in Mr. Russell's opinion, that subjectivism has been fostered in Protestant morality.

A similar opinion, in the most attenuated form, has been expressed by Salomon Reinach. "Instead of freedom of faith and thought the Reformation produced a kind of attenuated Catholicism. But the seeds of religious liberty were there, though it was only after two centuries that they blossomed and bore fruit, thanks to the breach made by Luther in the ancient edifice of Rome."

A judicious estimate is offered by Imbart de la Tour, to the effect that, though the logical result of some of Luther's premises would have been individual religion and autonomy of conscience, as actually worked out, "his mystical doctrine of inner inspiration has no resemblance whatever to our subjectivism." His true originality was his personality which imposed on an optimistic society a pessimistic world-view. It is true that the revolution was profound and yet it was not

modern: "the classic spirit, free institutions, democratic ideals, all these great forces by which we live are not the heritage of Luther."

As the wave of nationalism and militarism swept over Europe with the Bismarckian wars, men began to judge the Reformation as everything else by its relation, real or fancied, to racial superiority or power. Even in Germany scholars were not at all clear as to exactly what this relation was. Paul de Lagarde idealized the Middle Ages as showing the perfect expression of German character and he detested "the coarse, scolding Luther, who never saw further than his two hobnailed shoes, and who by his demagoguery, brought in barbarism and split Germany into fragments." Nevertheless even he saw, at times, that the Reformation meant a triumph of nationalism, and found it significant that the Basques, who were not a nation, should have produced, in Loyola and Xavier, the two greatest champions of the anti-national church.

The tide soon started flowing the other way and scholars began to see clearly that in some sort the Reformation was a triumph of "Deutschtum" against the "Romanitas" of Latin religion and culture. Treitschke, as the representative of this school, trumpeted forth that "the Reformation arose from the good German conscience," and that, "the Reformer of our church was the pioneer of the whole German nation on the road to a freer civilization." The dogma that might makes right was adopted at Berlin—as Acton wrote in 1886—and the mere fact that the Reformation was successful was accounted a proof of its rightness by historians like Waitz and Kurtz.

Naturally, all was not as bad as this. A rather attractive form of the thesis was presented by Karl Sell. Whereas, he thinks, Protestantism has died, or is dying, as a religion, it still exists as a mood, as bibliolatry, as a national and political cult, as a scientific and technical motive-power, and, last but not least, as the ethos and pathos of the Germanic peoples.

In the Great War Luther was mobilized as one of the German national assets. Professor Gustav Kawerau and



many others appealed to the Reformer's writings for inspiration and justification of their cause; and the German infantry sang "Ein' feste Burg" while marching to battle.

Even outside of Germany the war of 1870 meant, in many quarters, the defeat of the old liberalism and the rise of a new school inclined, even in America—witness Mahan—to see in armed force rather than in intellectual and moral ideas the decisive factors in history. Many scholars noticed, in this connection, the shift of power from the Catholic nations, led by France, to the Protestant peoples, Germany, England and America. Some, like Acton, though impressed by it, did not draw the conclusion ably presented by a Belgian, Emile de Laveleye, that the cause of national superiority lay in Protestantism, but it doubtless had a wide influence, partly unconscious, on the verdict of history.

But the recoil was far greater than the first movement. Paul Sabatier wrote (in 1913) that until 1870 Protestantism had enjoyed the esteem of thoughtful men on account of its good sense, domestic and civic virtues and its openness to science and literary criticism. This high opinion, strengthened by the prestige of German thought, was shattered, says our authority, by the results of the Franco-Prussian war, its rain of horrors, and the consequences to the victors, who saved of their superiority and attributed to Luther the result of Sedan.

The Great War loosed the tongues of all enemies of Luther. "Literary and philosophic Germany," said Denys Cochin in an interview, "prepared the evolution of the state and the cult of might. . . . The haughty and aristocratic reform of Luther both prepared and seconded the aberration."

Paquier has written a book around the thesis: "Nothing in the present war would have been alien to Luther, for like all Germans of to-day, he was violent and faithless. The theory of Nietzsche is monstrous, but it is the logical conclusion of the religious revolution accomplished by Luther and of the philosophical revolution accomplished by Kant." He finds the causal nexus between Luther and Hindenburg in two important doctrines and several corollaries. First, the doctrine of justification by faith meant the disparagement of

morality and the exaltation of the end at the expense of the means. Secondly, Luther deified the state. Finally, in his narrow patriotism, Luther is thought to have inspired the reckless deeds of his posterity.

On the other hand some French Protestants, notably Weiss, have sought to show that the modern doctrines of Prussia were not due to Luther but were an apostasy from him.

Practically all the older methods of interpreting the Reformation have survived to the present; to save space they must be noticed with the utmost brevity.

The Protestant scholars of the last sixty years have all, as far as they are worthy of serious notice, escaped from the crudely supernaturalistic point of view. Their temptation is now, in proportion as they are conservative, to read into the Reformation ideas of their own. Harnack sees in Luther, as he does in Christ and Paul and all other of his heroes, exactly his own German liberal Evangelical mind. He is inclined to admit that Luther was little help to the progress of science and enlightenment, that he did not absorb the cultural elements of his time nor recognize the right and duty of free research, but yet he thinks the Reformation more important than any other revolution since Paul simply because it restored the true, *i. e.* Pauline and Harnackian theology. Loisy's criticism of him is brilliant: "What would Luther have thought had his doctrine of salvation by faith been presented to him with the amendment 'independently of beliefs,' or with this amendment, 'faith in the merciful Father, for faith in the Son is foreign to the Gospel of Jesus'?" The same treatment of Mohammedanism, as that accorded by Harnack to Christianity would, as Loisy remarks, deduce from it the same humanitarian deism as that now fashionable at Berlin.

I should like to speak of the work of Below and Wernle, of Böhmer and Köhler, of Fisher and Walker and McGiffert, and of many other Protestant scholars, by which I have profited. But I can only mention one other Protestant tendency, that of some liberals who find the Reformation (quite naturally) too conservative for them. Laurent wrote in this

sense in 1862-70, and he was followed by one of the most thoughtful of Protestant apologists, Charles Beard. Beard saw in the Reformation the subjective form of religion over against the objectivity of Catholicism, and also, "the first great triumph of the scientific spirit"—the Renaissance, in fact, applied to theology. And yet he found its work so imperfect and even hampering at the time he wrote (1883) that the chief purpose of his book was to advocate a new Reformation to bring Christianity in complete harmony with science.

Several philosophers have, more from tradition than creed, adopted the Protestant standpoint. Eucken thinks that "the Reformation became the animating soul of the modern world, the principle motive-force of its progress. . . . In truth, every phase of modern life not directly or indirectly connected with the Reformation has something insipid and paltry about it." Windelband believes that the Reformation arose from mysticism but conquered only by the power of the state, and that the stamp of the conflict between the inner grace and the outward support is of the *esse* of Protestantism. William James was also in warm sympathy with Luther who, he thought, "in his immense, manly way . . . stretched the soul's imagination and saved theology from sterility." James added that the Reformer also invented a morality, as new as romantic love in literature, founded on a religious experience of despair breaking through the old, against pride.

While many Catholics, among them Maurenbrecher and Gasquet, labored fruitfully in the field of the Reformation by uncovering new facts, few or none of them had much new light to cast on the philosophy of the period. Janssen brought to its perfection a new method applied to a new field; the old was that of *Kulturgeschichte*, the method that of letting the sources speak for themselves, but naturally only those sources agreeable to the author's bias. In this way he represented the fifteenth century as the great blossoming of the German mind, and the Reformation as a blighting frost to both culture and morality. Pastor's work, though dense with fresh knowledge, offers no connected theory. The Reforma-

tion, he thinks, was a shock without parallel, involving all sides of life, but chiefly the religious. It was due in Germany to a union of the learned classes and the common people; in England to the caprice of an autocrat. From the learned uproar of Denifle's school emerges the explanation of the revolt as the "great sewer" which carried off from the church all the refuse and garbage of the time. Grisar's far finer psychology—characteristically Jesuit—tries to cast on Luther the origin of the present destructive subjectivism. Grisar's proof that "the modern infidel theology" of Germany bases itself in an exaggerated way on the Luther of the first period, is suggestive.

Though the Reformation was one of Lord Acton's favorite topics, I cannot find on that subject any new or fruitful thought at all in proportion to his vast learning. His theory of the Reformation is therefore the old Catholic one, stripped of supernaturalism, that it was merely the product of the wickedness and vagaries of a few gifted demagogues, and the almost equally blamable obstinacy of a few popes. He thought the English Bishop Creighton too easy in his judgment of the popes, adding, "My dogma is not the special wickedness of my own spiritual superiors, but the general wickedness of men in authority—of Luther and Zwingli and Calvin and Cranmer and Knox, of Mary Stuart and Henry VIII, of Philip II and Elizabeth, of Cromwell and Louis XIV, James and Charles, William, Bossuet and Ken." Acton dated modern times from the turn of the 15th and 16th centuries, believing that the fundamental characteristic of the period is the belief in conscience as the voice of God. He says, that "Luther at Worms is the most pregnant and momentous fact in our history," but he confesses himself baffled by the problem, which is, to his mind, why Luther did not return to the church. Luther, alleges Acton, gave up all the doctrines commonly insisted on as crucial and, then or later, dropped predestination, and admitted the necessity of good works, the freedom of the will, the hierarchical constitution, the authority of tradition, the seven sacraments, the Latin Mass. In fact, says Acton, the one bar to his return to the church was his belief that the pope was Antichrist.

It is notable that none of the free minds starting from Catholicism have been attracted to the Protestant camp. Renan prophesied that St. Paul and Protestantism were coming to the end of their reign. Paul Sabatier carefully proved that the Modernists owed nothing to Luther, and their greatest scholar, Loisy, succinctly put the case in the remark, "We are done with partial heresies."

The Anglicans have joined the Romanists to denounce as heretics those who rebelled against the church which still calls Anglicans heretics. Neville Figgis, having snatched from Treitschke the juxtaposition "Luther and Machiavelli," has labored to build up around it a theory by which these two men shall appear as the chief supports of absolutism and "divine right of kings." Figgis thinks that with the Reformation religion was merely the "performance for passing entertainment," but that the state was the "eternal treasure." A far more judicious and unprejudiced discussion of the same thesis is offered in the works of Professor A. F. Polard. He sees both sides of the medal for, if religion had become a subject of politics, politics had become matter of religion. He thinks the English Reformation was primarily a revolt of the laity against the clergy.

The liberal estimate of the Reformation fashionable a hundred years ago has also been revived in an elaborate work of Mackinnon, and is assumed in obiter dicta by such eminent historians as A. W. Benn, E. P. Cheyney, C. Borgeaud, H. L. Osgood and Woodrow Wilson. Finally, Professor J. H. Robinson has improved the old political interpretation current among the secular historians of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The essence of the Lutheran movement he finds in the revolt from the Roman ecclesiastical state.

## 5. Concluding Estimate

The reader will expect me, after having given some account of the estimates of others, to make an evaluation of my own. Of course no view can be final; mine, like that of everyone else, is the expression of an age and an environment as well as that of an individual.



The Reformation, like the Renaissance and the sixteenth-century Social Revolution, was but the consequence of the operation of antecedent changes in environment and habit, intellectual and economic. There was the widening and deepening of knowledge, due in one aspect to the invention of printing, in the other to the geographical and historical discoveries of the fifteenth century and the consequent adumbration of the idea of natural law. Even in the later schoolmen, like Biel and Occam, still more in the humanists, one finds a much stronger rationalism than in the representative thinkers of the Middle Ages. The general economic antecedent was the growth in wealth and the change in the system of production from gild and barter to that of money and wages. This produced three secondary results, which in turn operated as causes: the rise of the moneyed class, individualism, and nationalism.

All these tendencies, operating in three fields, the religious, the political and the intellectual, produced the Reformation and its sisters, the Renaissance and the Social Revolution of the sixteenth century. The Reformation—including in that term both the Protestant movement and the Catholic reaction—partly occupied all these fields, but did not monopolize any of them. There were some religious, or anti-religious movements outside the Reformation, and the Lutheran impulse swept into its own domain large tracts of the intellectual and political fields, primarily occupied by Renaissance and Revolution.

(1) The *gêne* felt by many secular historians in the treatment of religion is now giving way to the double conviction of the importance of the subject and of its susceptibility to scientific study. Religion in human life is not a subject apart, nor is it necessary to regard all theological revolts as obscurantist. As a rationalist<sup>2</sup> has remarked, it is usually priests who have freed mankind from taboos and superstitions. Indeed, in a religious age, no effective attack on the existing church is possible save one inspired by piety.

Many instructive parallels to the Reformation can be

<sup>2</sup> S. Reinach: *Cultes, Mythes et Religions*, iv, 467.

found both in Christian history and in that of other religions; they all markedly show the same consequences of the same causes. The publication of Christianity, with its propaganda of monotheism against the Roman world and its accentuation of faith against the ceremonialism of the Jewish church, resembled that of Luther's "gospel." Marcion with his message of Pauline faith and his criticism of the Bible, was a second-century Reformer. The iconoclasm and nationalism of the Emperor Leo furnish striking similarities to the Protestant Revolt. The movements started by the medieval mystics and still more by the heretics Wyclif and Huss, rehearsed the religious drama of the sixteenth century. Many revivals in the Protestant church, such as Methodism, were, like the original movement, returns to personal piety and biblicism. The Old Catholic schism in its repudiation of the papal supremacy, and even Modernism, notwithstanding its disclaimers, are animated in part by the same motives as those inspiring the Reformers. In Judaism the Sadducees, in their bibliolatry and in their opposition to the traditions dear to the Pharisees, were Protestants; a later counterpart of the same thing is found in the reform of the Karaites by Anan ben David. Mohammed has been a favorite subject for comparison with Luther by the Catholics, but in truth, in no disparaging sense, the proclamation of Islam, with its monotheism, emphasis on faith and predestination, was very like the Reformation, and so were several later reforms within Mohammedanism, including two in the sixteenth century. Many parallels could doubtless be adduced from the heathen religions, perhaps the most striking is the foundation of Sikhism by Luther's contemporary Nanak, who preached monotheism and revolted from the ancient ceremonial and hierarchy of caste.

What is the etiology of religious revolution? The principal law governing it is that any marked change either in scientific knowledge or in ethical feeling necessitates a corresponding alteration in the faith. All the great religious innovations of Luther and his followers can be explained as an attempt to readjust faith to the new culture, partly intellectual, partly

social, that had gradually developed during the later Middle Ages.

The first shift, and the most important, was that from salvation by works to salvation by faith only. The Catholic dogma is that salvation is dependent on certain sacraments, grace being bestowed automatically (*ex opere operato*) on all who participate in the celebration of the rite without actively opposing its effect. Luther not only reduced the number of sacraments but he entirely changed their character. Not they, but the faith of the participant mattered, and this faith was bestowed freely by God, or not at all. In this innovation one primary cause was the individualism of the age; the sense of the worth of the soul or, if one pleases, of the ego. This did not mean subjectivism, or religious autonomy, for the Reformers held passionately to an ideal of objective truth, but it did mean that every soul had the right to make its personal account with God, without mediation of priest or sacrament. Another element in this new dogma was the simpler, and yet more profound, psychology of the new age. The shift of emphasis from the outer to the inner is traceable from the earliest age to the present, from the time when Homer delighted to tell of the good blows struck in fight to the time when fiction is but the story of an inner, spiritual struggle. The Reformation was one phase in this long process from the external to the internal. The debit and credit balance of outward work and merit was done away, and for it was substituted the nobler, or at least more spiritual and less mechanical, idea of disinterested morality and unconditioned salvation. The God of Calvin may have been a tyrant, but he was not corruptible by bribes.

We are so much accustomed to think of dogma as the *esse* of religion that it is hard for us to do justice to the importance of this change. Really, it is not dogma so much as rite and custom that is fundamental. The sacramental habit of mind was common to medieval Christianity and to most primitive religions. For the first time Luther substituted for the sacramental habit, or attitude, its antithesis, an almost purely ethical criterion of faith. The transcendental philos-

ophy and the categorical imperative lay implicit in the famous *sola fide*.

The second great change made by Protestantism was more intellectual, that from a pluralistic to a monistic standpoint. Far from the conception of natural law, the early Protestants did little or nothing to rationalize, or explain away, the creeds of the Catholics, but they had arrived at a sufficiently monistic philosophy to find scandal in the worship of the saints, with its attendant train of daily and trivial miracles. To sweep away the vast hierarchy of angels and canonized persons that made Catholicism quasi-polytheistic, and to preach pure monotheism was in the spirit of the time and is a phenomenon for which many parallels can be found. Instructive is the analogy of the contemporary trend to absolutism; neither God nor king any longer needed intermediaries.

(2) In two aspects the Reformation was the religious expression of the current political and economic change. In the first place it reflected and reacted upon the growing national self-consciousness, particularly of the Teutonic peoples. The revolt from Rome was in the interests of the state church, and also of Germanic culture. The break-up of the Roman church at the hands of the Northern peoples is strikingly like the break-up of the Roman Empire under pressure from their ancestors. Indeed, the limits of the Roman church practically coincided with the boundaries of the Empire. The apparent exception of England proves the rule, for in Britain the Roman civilization was swept away by the German invasions of the fifth and following centuries.

That the Reformation strengthened the state was inevitable, for there was no practical alternative to putting the final authority in spiritual matters, after the pope had been ejected, into the hands of the civil government. Congregationalism was tried and failed as tending to anarchy. But how little the Reformation was really responsible for the new despotism and the divine right of kings, is clear from a comparison with the Greek church and the Turkish Empire. In both, the same forces which produced the state churches of West-

ern Europe operated in the same way. Selim I, a bigoted Sunnite, after putting down the Shi'ite heresy, induced the last caliph of the Abbasid dynasty to surrender the sword and mantle of the prophet; thereafter he and his successors were caliphs as well as sultans. In Russia Ivan the Terrible made himself, in 1547, head of the national church.

Protestantism also harmonized with the capitalistic revolution in that its ethics are, far more than those of Catholicism, oriented by a reference to this world. The old monastic ideal of celibacy, solitude, mortification of the flesh, prayer and meditation, melted under the sun of a new prosperity. In its light men began to realize the ethical value of this life, of marriage, of children, of daily labor and of success and prosperity. It was just in this work that Protestantism came to see its chance of serving God and one's neighbor best. The man at the plough, the maid with the broom, said Luther, are doing God better service than does the praying, self-tormenting monk.

Moreover, the accentuation of the virtues of thrift and industry, which made capitalism and Calvinism allies, but reflected the standards natural to the bourgeois class. It was by the might of the merchants and their money that the Reformation triumphed; conversely they benefited both by the spoils of the church and by the abolition of a privileged class. Luther stated that there was no difference between priest and layman; some men were called to preach, others to make shoes, but—and this is his own illustration—the one vocation is no more spiritual than the other. No longer necessary as a mediator and dispenser of sacramental grace, the Protestant clergyman sank inevitably to the same level as his neighbors.

(3) In its relation to the Renaissance and to modern thought the Reformation solved, in its way, two problems, or one problem, that of authority, in two forms. Though anything but consciously rational in their purpose, the innovating leaders did assert, at least for themselves, the right of private judgment. Appealing from indulgence-seller to pope, from pope to council, from council to the Bible and



(in Luther's own words) from the Bible to Christ, the Reformers finally came to their own conscience as the supreme court. Trying to deny to others the very rights they had fought to secure for themselves, yet their example operated more powerfully than their arguments, even when these were made of ropes and of thumb-screws. The delicate balance of faith was overthrown and it was put into a condition of unstable equilibrium; the avalanche, started by ever so gentle a push, swept onward until it buried the men who tried to stop it half way. Dogma slowly narrowing down from precedent to precedent had its logical, though unintended, outcome in complete religious autonomy, yes, in infidelity and skepticism.

Protestantism has been represented now as the ally, now as the enemy of humanism. Consciously it was neither. Rather, it was the vulgarization of the Renaissance; it transformed, adapted, and popularized many of the ideas originated by its rival. It is easy to see now that the future lay rather outside of both churches than in either of them, if we look only for direct descent. Columbus burst the bounds of the world, Copernicus those of the universe; Luther only broke his vows. But the point is that the repudiation of religious vows was the hardest to do at that time, a feat infinitely more impressive to the masses than either of the former. It was just here that the religious movement became a great solvent of conservatism; it made the masses think, passionately if not deeply, on their own beliefs. It broke the cake of custom and made way for greater emancipations than its own. It was the logic of events that, whereas the Renaissance gave freedom of thought to the cultivated few, the Reformation finally resulted in tolerance for the masses. Logically also, even while it feared and hated philosophy in the great thinkers and scientists, it advocated education, up to a certain point, for the masses.

In summary, if the Reformation is judged with historical imagination, it does not appear to be primarily a reaction. That it should be such is both *a priori* improbable and unsupported by the facts. The Reformation did not give our

answer to the many problems it was called upon to face; nevertheless it gave the solution demanded and accepted by the time, and therefore historically the valid solution. With all its limitations it was, fundamentally, a step forward and not the return to an earlier standpoint, either to that of primitive Christianity, as the Reformers themselves claimed, or to the dark ages, as has been latterly asserted.

# Bibliography

## PRELIMINARY

### 1. Unpublished Sources

THE AMOUNT of important unpublished documents on the Reformation, though still large, is much smaller than that of printed sources, and the value of these manuscripts is less than that of those which have been published. It is no purpose of this bibliography to furnish a guide to archives.

Though the quantity of unpublished material that I have used has been small, it has proved unexpectedly rich. In order to avoid repetition in each following chapter, I will here summarize manuscript material used (most of it for the first time), which is either still unpublished or is in course of publication by myself. See *Luther's Correspondence*, transl. and ed. by Preserved Smith and C. M. Jacobs, 1913 ff; *English Historical Review*, July 1919; *Scottish Historical Review*, Jan. 1919; *Harvard Theological Review*, April 1919; *The N. Y. Nation*, various dates 1919.

From the Bodleian Library, I have secured a copy of an unpublished letter and other fragments of Luther, press mark, Montagu d. 20, fol. 225, and Auct. Z. ii, 2.

From the British Museum I have had diplomatic correspondence of Robert Barnes, Cotton MSS., Vitellius B XXI, foll. 120 ff.; a letter of Albinianus Tretius to Luther, Add. MS. 19, 959, fol. 4b ff; and a portion of John Foxe's *Collection of Letters and Papers*, Harleian MS 419, fol. 125.

From the Pennsylvania Historical Society, Philadelphia, collection of autographs made by Ferdinand J. Dreer, unpublished and hitherto unused letters of Erasmus, James VI of Scotland (2), Leo X, Hedio, Farel to Calvin, Forster, Melancthon, Charles V, Albrecht of Mansfeld, Henry VIII, Francis I (3), Catherine de' Medici, Grynaeus, Viglius van Zuichem, Alphonso d'Este, Philip Marnix, Camden, Tasso, Machiavelli Pius IV, Vassari, Borromeo, Alesandro Ottavio de' Medici (afterwards Leo XI), Clement VIII, Sarpi, Emperor Fer-

dinand, William of Nassau (1559), Maximilian III, Paul Eber (2), Rudolph II, Henry III, Philip II, Emanuel Philibert, Henry IV, Scaliger, Mary Queen of Scots, Robert Dudley (Leicester), Filippo Strozzi, and others.

From Wellesley College a patent of Charles V., dated Worms, March 6, 1521, granting mining rights to the Count of Belalcazar. Unpublished.

From the American Hispanic Society of New York unpublished letter of Henry IV of France to Du Pont, on his conversion, and letter of Henry VII of England to Ferdinand of Aragon.

## 2. General Works

*Encyclopædia Britannica*. 1910-1. (Many valuable articles of a thoroughly scientific character).

*The New International Encyclopædia*, 1915f. (Equally valuable).

*Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*. 24 vols. Leipzig. 1896-1913. (Indispensable to the student of Church History; The Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge, 12 vols., 1908 ff, though in part based on this, is far less valuable for the present subject).

Wetzer und Welte: *Kirchenlexikon oder Encyklopädie der katholischen Theologie und ihrer Hülfswissenschaften*. Zweite Auflage von J. Card. Hergenröther und F. Kaulen. Freiburg im Breisgau. 1880-1901. 12 vols. (Valuable).

*Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, hg. von H. Gunkel, O. Scheel, F. M. Schiele. 5 vols. 1909-13.

*The Cambridge Modern History*, planned by Lord Acton, edited by A. W. Ward, G. W. Prothero, Stanley Leathes. London and New York. 1902 ff. Vol. 1. *The Renaissance*. 1902. Vol. 2. *The Reformation*. 1904. Vol. 3. *The Wars of Religion*. 1905. Vol. 13. *Tables and Index*. 1911. Vol. 14. *Maps*. 1912. (A standard co-operative work, with full bibliographies).

*Weltgeschichte*, hg.v.J. von Pflugk-Harttung: *Das Religiöse Zeitalter, 1500-1650*. Berlin. 1907. (A co-operative work, written by masters of their subjects in popular style. Profusely illustrated).

E. Lavissee et A. Rambaud: *Histoire generale du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle à nos jours*. Tome IV *Renaissance et reforme, les nouveaux mondes 1492-1559*. 1894. Tome V. *Les guerres de religion 1559-1648*. 1895.

R. L. Poole: *Historical Atlas of Modern Europe*. 1902.

W. R. Shepherd: *Historical Atlas*. 1911.

Ramsay Muir: *Hammond's New Historical Atlas for Students*. 1914.

A list of general histories of the Reformation will be found in the bibliography to the last chapter.

An excellent introduction to the bibliography of the public documents of all countries will be found in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, s.v. "Record."

## CHAPTER 1

### SOCIAL CONDITIONS

As the sources for this chapter would include all the extant literature and documents of the period, it is impossible to do more than mention a few of those particularly referred to. Moreover, as most political histories now have chapters on social and economic conditions, a great deal on the subject will be found in the previous bibliographies.

#### *General*

##### SOURCES:

Wm. Harrison's *Description of England* (1577, revised and enlarged 1586) ed. F. J. Furnivall. 1877 ff. 7 parts.

*Social Tracts*, ed. A. Lang from Arber's *English Garner*. 1904.

##### LITERATURE:

*Handwörterbuch der Staatswissenschaften*, ed. J. Conrad, W. A. Lexis, E. Loening. 8 vols. 1909-11. (Standard).

*Wörterbuch der Volkswirtschaft*, hg. von L. Elster. 2 vols. 1911.

*Social England*, ed. by H. D. Traill and J. S. Mann. Vol. 3. Henry VIII to Elizabeth. 1902. (Standard work, originally published 1894).

S. B. Fay: *The Hohenzollern Household*. 1916.

*A Catalogue of French Economic Documents from the 16th,*



- 17th and 18th Centuries, published by the John Crerar Library, Chicago, 1918.
- H. van Houtte: *Documents pour servir à l'histoire des prix de 1387 à 1794*. 1902.
- Cavaignac: "La Population de l'Espagne vers 1500," *Séances et Travaux de l'Académie des Sciences morales et politiques*, 79e Année, 1919, pp. 491 ff. (puts the population at ten to twelve millions).
- J. Culevier: *Les dénombremments de foyers en Brabant (XVIe et XVIIe siècles.)* 1912.
- W. Cunningham: *Essay on Western Civilization in its Economic Aspect*. Vol. 2. 1900.
- J. Beloch: "Die Bevölkerung Europas zur Zeit der Renaissance." *Zeitschrift für Sozialwissenschaft*, iii, 1900, pp. 765-86.
- D. J. Hill: *A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe*. Vol. 2. 1910.
- C. H. Haring: "American Gold and Silver Production in the first half of the Sixteenth Century," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May, 1915.
- C. H. Haring: *Trade and Navigation between Spain and the Indies in the Time of the Hapsburgs*. 1918.
- L. Felix: *Der Einfluss von Staat und Recht auf die Entwicklung des Eigentums*. 2te Hälfte, 2te Abteilung. 1903.
- G. Wiebe: *Zur Geschichte der Preisrevolution der 16. und 17. Jahrhunderten*, in Von Miaskowski: *Staats und sozialwissenschaftliche Beiträge*, II, 2. 1895. (Important.)
- G. d' Avenel: *Histoire économique de la propriété, des salaires, des denrées et de tous les prix en général 1200-1800*. 6 vols. 1894 ff. (Wonderfully interesting work).
- G. d'Avenel: *Découvertes d'Histoire Sociale*. 1910. (Brief summary of his larger work).
- W. Naudé: *Die Getreidehandelspolitik der Europäischen Staaten von 13ten bis zum 18ten Jahrhundert*. 1896.
- N. S. B. Gras: *The Evolution of the English Corn Market*. 1915.
- A. P. Usher: *The History of the Grain Trade in France, 1400-1710*. 1913.

- K. Häbler: *Die wirtschaftliche Blüte Spaniens im 16. Jahrhundert und ihr Verfall*. 1888.
- B. Moses: "The Economic Condition of Spain in the 16th Century." *American Historical Association Reports*. 1893.
- E. P. Cheyney: *Social Changes in England in the Sixteenth Century as Reflected in Contemporary Literature*. Part I, Rural Changes. 1895.
- A. Luschin von Ebengreuth: *Allgemeine Münzkunde und Geldgeschichte des Mittelalters und der neueren Zeit*. 1904.

### *Life of the People*

#### SOURCES:

- Das Zimmersche Chronik*, hg. v. K. A. Barack. 4 vols. 1861-2.
- Social Germany in Luther's Time*, the Memoirs of Bartholomew Sastrow, translated by A. D. Vandam. 1902.
- T. Tusser: *A Hundred Points of Good Husbandrie*. 1558. (Later expanded as: *Five Hundred Points of Good Husbandry united to as many of Good Huswifery*. 1573).
- L. von Pastor: *Die Reise Kardinals Luigi d'Aragona 1517-8*. 1905. (Ergänzungen und Erläuterungen zu Janssens Geschichte des deutschen Volkes. Band IV, Teil 4).
- Baldassare Castiglione: *The Book of the Courtier*. English translation by Opdycke. 1903.
- The Seconde Parte of a Register: being a Calendar of Manuscripts under that title intended for publication by the Puritans*. 1593. By A. Peel. 2 vols. 1915.

#### TREATISES:

- E. B. Bax: *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages*. 1894.
- P. V. B. Jones: *Household of a Tudor Nobleman*. 1917.
- W. B. Rye: *England as seen by Foreigners in the Days of Elizabeth and James I*. 1865.
- C. L. Powell: *English Domestic Relations, 1487-1653: a study of Matrimony and Family Life in Theory and Practice as revealed in the Literature, Law and History of the Period*. 1917.

- W. Kawerau: *Die Reformation und die Ehe*. 1892.
- P. S. Allen: *The Age of Erasmus*. 1914.
- K. R. Greenfield: *Sumptuary Laws of Nürnberg*. 1918.
- Preserved Smith: "Some old Blue Laws," *Open Court*, April, 1915.
- H. Almann: *Das Leben des deutschen Volkes beim Beginn der Neuzeit*. 1893.
- E. S. Bates: *Touring in 1600*. 1911.
- T. F. Ordish: *The Early London Theatres*. 1894.
- J. Cartwright: *Baldassare Castiglione*. 2 vols. 1908.
- J. L. Pagel: *Geschichte der Medizin*. Zweite Auflage von K. Südhoff. 1915.
- A. H. Buck: *The Growth of Medicine from the Earliest Times to about 1800*. 1917.
- H. Haeser: *Geschichte der Medicin*. Band II. 1881.
- F. H. Garrison: *An Introduction to the History of Medicine*. 1914.
- J. Löhr: *Methodisch-kritische Beiträge zur Geschichte der Sittlichkeit des Klerus, besonders der Erzdiözese Köln am Ausgang des Mittelalters*. 1910.
- H. A. Krose: *Der Einfluss der Konfession auf die Sittlichkeit nach den Ergebnissen der Statistik*. 1900.
- Henri (J. A.) Baudrillart: *Histoire du luxe privé et public depuis l'antiquité jusqu' à nos jours*. Vol. 3, *Moyen Age et Renaissance*. 1879.

## CHAPTER 2

### THE CAPITALISTIC REVOLUTION

Many of the books referred to in the last chapter and many general histories have chapters on the subject. Their titles are not repeated here.

- English Economic History*. Select Documents ed. by A. E. Bland, P. A. Brown and R. H. Tawney. 1914. (With helpful bibliographies and well-selected material).
- H. G. Rosedale: *Queen Elizabeth and the Levant Company*. 1904.

- E. Levasseur: *Histoire des classes ouvrières et de l'industrie en France avant 1789*. 2 vols. 1900-1.
- G. Avenel: *Paysans et Ouvriers depuis sept cent ans*. 1904.
- W. Cunningham: *The Growth of English Industry and Commerce, during the Early and Middle Ages*. 1910. Modern Times. 1894.
- W. J. Ashley: *The Economic Organisation of England*. 1914. (Brief, brilliant).
- G. Unwin: *The Industrial Organization of England in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries*. 1904. (Scholarly).
- A. P. Usher: *The Industrial History of England*. 1920.
- J. W. Burgon: *Life and Times of Sir T. Gresham*. 2 vols. 1839.
- D. Noël: *Histoire du commerce du monde*. 3 vols. 1891-1906.
- H. G. Selfridge: *The Romance of Commerce*. 1918.
- J. A. Williamson: *Maritime Enterprise 1485-1558*. 1913.
- H. Strieder: *Die Inventar der Firma Fugger aus dem Jahre 1527*. 1905.
- H. Strieder: *Zur Genesis des modernen Kapitalismus*. 1904.
- H. Strieder: *Studien zur Geschichte kapitalistischer Organisationsformen: Monopole, Kartelle und Aktiengesellschaften im Mittelalter und zu Beginn der Neuzeit*. 1914. (Highly important).
- W. H. Day: *History of Commerce*. 1907.
- V. Mück: *Der Mansfelder Kupferschieferbergbau*. 1910.
- J. Ehrenberg: *Das Zeitalter der Fugger*. Band I, 1896.
- J. A. Herrick: *History of Commerce and Industry*. 1917. (Text-book).
- J. P. Rooseboom: *The Scottish Staple in the Netherlands, 1292-1676*. 1910.
- J. Sombart: *Krieg und Kapitalismus*. 1913.
- J. Sombart: *Der Moderne Kapitalismus?* 2 vols. in 3. 1916-7.
- Brentano: *Die Anfänge des modernen Kapitalismus*. 1916.
- Schulte: *Die Fugger in Rom*. 2 vols. 1904.
- Maxime Kowalewsky: *Die ökonomische Entwicklung Europas bis zum Beginn der kapitalistischen Wirtschaftsform. Aus dem Russischen übersetzt von A. Stein*. Vol. 6. 1913. (Important).

- R. E. Prothero: *English Farming Past and Present*. 1912.
- E. F. Gay: "Inclosures in England in the 16th Century," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 17, 1903.
- E. F. Gay: *Zur Geschichte der Einhegungen in England*. 1902. (Berlin dissertation).
- J. S. Leadam: *The Domesday of Inclosures*. 1897.
- J. E. T. Rogers: *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*. 1884.
- J. E. T. Rogers: *A History of Agriculture and Prices in England*. Vols. iii and iv, 1400–1582. 1882. (A classic).
- J. Klein: *The Mesta: A Study in Spanish Economic History*. 1920.
- R. H. Tawney: *The Agrarian Problem in the Sixteenth Century*. 1912.
- W. Stolze: *Zur Vorgeschichte des Bauernkrieges*. (Staats-und-sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen, hg. von G. Schmoller. Band 18, Heft 4). 1900.
- J. Hayem: *Les Grèves dans les Temps Modernes. Mémoires et Documents pour servir à l'histoire du commerce et de l'industrie en France*. 1911.
- L. Feuchtwanger: "Geschichte der sozialen Politik und des Armenwesens im Zeitalter der Reformation." *Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung*, 1908, xxxii, and 1909, xxxiii.
- J. S. Schapiro: *Social Reform and the Reformation*. 1909.
- G. Uhlhorn: *Die Christliche Liebestätigkeit*. 1895.
- E. M. Leonard: *The Early History of English Poor Relief*. 1900.
- O. Winckelmann: "Die Armenordnungen von Nürnberg (1522), Kitzingen (1523), Regensburg (1523) und Yper (1525)," *Archiv für Reformationsgeschichte*, x, 1913 and xi, 1914.
- J. L. Vives: *Concerning the Relief of the Poor*, tr. by M. M. Sherwood. 1917.
- Liber Vagatorum*, reprinted, with Luther's preface, in *Luther Werke*, Weimar, vol. xxvi, pp. 634 ff.
- Brooks Adams: *The New Empire*. 1902. (Fanciful).
- K. Lamprecht: *Zum Verständnis der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Wandlungen in Deutschland vom 14–16. Jahrhundert*. 1893.



- Shakespeare's England*, by various authors. 2 vols. 1916. chap. xi, G. Unwin: "Commerce and Coinage."
- II. Schönebaum: "Antwerpens Blütezeit im XVI. Jahrhundert." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte*, xiii. 1917.
- D. Winckelmann: "Ueber die ältesten Armenordnungen der Reformationszeit." *Historische Vierteljahrschrift*, xvii. 1914-5.
- Stella Kramer: *The English Craft Gilds and the Government*. 1905.
- Niederländische Akten und Urkunden zur Geschichte der Hanse und zur deutschen Seegeschichte . . . bearbeitet von R. Häpke. Band I (1531-57)*. 1913.
- V. Cunningham: *Progress of Capitalism in England*. 1916.

## CHAPTER 3

### MAIN CURRENTS OF THOUGHT

- § 1. *Biblical and Classical Scholarship*
- Novum Instrumentum omne, diligenter ab Erasmo Rot. recognitum et emendatum*. Basileae. 1516. (Nearly 300 editions catalogued in the Bibliotheca Erasmi. In *Erasmi Opera Omnia*, 1703, vol. VI.)
- Novum testamentum graece et latine in academia Complutensi noviter impressum*. 1514. *Vetus testamentum multiplici lingua nunc primum impressum*. In hac praeclarissima *Complutensi universitate*. 1517.
- R. Gregory: *Die Textkritik des Neuen Testaments*. 3 parts. 1900-9.
- Articles "Bible," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, *Protestantische Realencyklopädie*, and *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*.
- von Dobschütz: *The Influence of the Bible on Civilization*. 1913.
- Falk: *Die Bibel am Ausgange des Mittelalters, ihre Kenntnis und ihre Verbreitung*. 1905.
- Martin Luther's *Deutsche Bibel*, in *Sämmtliche Werke*, Weimar, separately numbered, vols. i, ii, iii, v.

- K. Fullerton: "Luther's doctrine and criticism of Scripture," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. and April, 1906.
- H. Zerener: *Studien über das beginnende Eindringen der lutherischen Bibelübersetzung in der deutschen Literatur*. 1911.
- Lutherstudien zur 4. Jahrhundertfeier der Reformation, von den Mitarbeitern der Weimarer Lutherausgabe*. 1917. pp. 203 ff.
- K. A. Meissinger: *Luther's Exegese in der Frühzeit*. 1911.
- O. Reichert: *Martin Luther's Deutsche Bibel*. 1910.
- Sir H. H. Howorth: "The Biblical Canon according to the Continental Reformers," *Journal of Theological Studies* ix, 188 ff. (1907-8).
- J. P. Hentz: *History of the Lutheran Version of the Bible*. 1910.
- D. Lortsch: *Histoire de la Bible en France*. 1910.
- A. W. Pollard: *Records of the English Bible*. 1911.
- S. C. Macauley: "The English Bible," *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1911, pp. 505 ff.
- W. Canton: *The Bible and the Anglo-Saxon People*. 1914.
- H. T. Peck: *A History of Classical Philology*. 1911.
- Sir J. E. Sandys: "Scholarship," chap. ix in *Shakespeare's England*, 1916.
- Sir J. E. Sandys: *A History of Classical Scholarship*. Vol. ii. 1908. (Standard).
- H. Hallam: *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries*. 1837-9. (Very comprehensive, in part antiquated, somewhat external but on the whole excellent).

## § 2.

*History*

## TREATISES:

- E. Fueter: *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie*. 1911. French translation, revised, 1916. (Work of brilliance philosophical, reliable, readable).
- M. Ritter: "Studien über die Entwicklung der Geschichtswissenschaft." *Historische Zeitschrift*, cit. (1912). 261 ff.
- E. Menke-Glückert: *Die Geschichtschreibung der Reformation und Gegenreformation. Bodin und die Begründung d*

- Geschichtsmethodologie durch Bartholomäus Keckermann*. 1912.
- Joachimsen: *Geschichtsauffassung und Geschichtschreibung in Deutschland unter dem Einfluss des Humanismus*. Teil I. 1910.
- L. Burr: "The Freedom of History," *American Historical Review*, xxii, 261 f. 1916.
- Morel-Fatio: *Historiographie de Charles-Quint*. 1913.
- C. Baur: *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*. 1852.
- von Ranke: *Zur Kritik neueren Geschichtschreiber*. 1874.
- Wolf: *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationgeschichte*. Vol. i, 1915; vol. ii, 1916.
- Article, "History" in *Encyclopedia Americana*, ed. of 1919.

#### ORIGINALS:

- Machiavelli: *Istorie fiorentine*. (to 1492). First ed. 1561-64. Numerous editions, and English translation by C. E. Detmold: *The Historical, Political and Diplomatic Writings of N. Machiavelli*. 4 vols. 1882.
- Francesco Guicciardini: *Storia fiorentina*. (1378-1509). First published 1859. *Istoria d' Italia*. (1492-1534). First edition 1561-64; numerous editions since, and English translation by G. Fenton: *The historie of Guicciardini*. 1599.
- Benvenuto Cellini: *Life*, translated by R. H. H. Cust. 2 vols. 1910. (The original text first correctly published by O. Bacci, 1901. Many English translations).
- Julius Jovius: *Historiarum sui temporis libri*. xlv. (1403-1547). 1550-52.
- Hydore Vergil: *Anglicae Historiae libri*. xxvii. (to 1538). First edition, to 1509, Basle, 1534; 2d ed. 1555. (I use the edition of 1570. The best criticism is in H. A. L. Fisher's *Political History of England 1485-1547*, pp. 152 ff.)
- Hydore Vergil: *De rerum inventoribus libri octo*. 1536. 2d ed., enlarged, 1557.
- Cesar Baronius: *Annales Ecclesiastici* (to 1198). Rome. 1588-1607.

- Ecclesiastica Historia . . . secundum centurias, a M. Flacio, et aliis. Magdeburg. 1559-74.*
- H. Bullinger: *Reformationsgeschichte*, hg. von J. J. Hottinger und H. H. Vögeli. 3 vols. 1838-40. (Index to this in preparation by W. Wuhrmann; Bullinger's Correspondence will also soon appear).
- Joan. Sleidani: *De statu religionis et reipublicae, Carolo Quinto Caesare, commentariorum libri xxvi.* 1555. (My edition, 1785, 3 vols., was owned formerly by I. Döllinger).
- Joannis Cochlaei: *Historia de Actis et scriptis M. Lutheri 1517-46.* Coloniae. 1549. (Critique in A. Herte's dissertation, *Die Lutherbiographie des J. Cochlaeus.* 1915).
- J. Mathesius: *Siebzehn Predigten von den Historien des Herrn Doctoris Martini Luthers.* 1st ed. 1566; new ed. by Lösche, 1898.
- Mémoires de Martin et de Guillaume du Bellay:* (1513-52). 1st ed. 1569. Critical ed. by V. L. Bourrilly and Fleury Vindry, 1908 ff.
- Blaise de Monluc: *Commentaires* (1521-76); 1st ed. 1592 critical ed. by P. Courtreault. 1911-14.
- Oeuvres de P. de Bourdeille, Seigneur de Brantôme*, ed. L. Lallanne. 11 vols. 1864 ff.
- J. J. Scaliger: *Opus novum de emendatione temporum.* 1583-1593.
- Histoire ecclésiastique des églises françaises réformées.* Published by Baum et Cunitz. 3 vols. 1883-9. (Attributed, with probability, to Beza; first published 1580).
- Jean Bodin: *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem* 1566.
- Peter Martyr d' Anghiera: *Opus epistolarum.* 1530. (This rare edition at Harvard. The work is a history in the form of letters, partly fictitious, partly genuine. Cf. J. Bernays: *Peter Martyr Anghierensis und sein Opus Epistolarum.* 1891).
- Ignatius de Loyola: *Autobiography. Monumenta Societatis Jesu*, ser. iv, tom. 1, 1904. English translation ed. by J. F. O'Connor. 1900.
- George Buchanan: *Rerum scoticarum historia.* Edinburg 1582. (Cf. M. Meyer-Cohn: *G. Buchanan als Publizist und Historiker Maria Stuarts.* 1913).

John Knox: *The History of the Reformation of Religion within the realm of Scotland*. (First incomplete edition, 1586; critical complete edition by D. Laing, 1846, in vol. 1 of Knox's Works. Cf. A. Lang: "Knox as Historian," *Scottish Historical Review*, ii, 1905, pp. 113 ff).

John Foxe: *Acts and Monuments of the Christian Martyrs*. 1563. (The MS that I have compared with Foxe is Harleian MS 419 of the British Museum, endorsed: "John Foxe's Collection of Letters and Papers on Theological Matters," fol. 125).

Nicholas Sanders: *De origine et progressu schismatis Anglicani*. 1585.

Edward Hall: *The Union of the Noble and Illustrious Families of Lancaster and York*, 1542. Published as Hall's *Chronicle*, 1809.

Raphael Holinshed: *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*. Vol. 1, 1577.

John Stow: *The Chronicles of England from Brute unto this present year of Christ 1580*. Second edition, *The Annals of England*, 1592.

### § 3. Political Theory

#### SOURCES:

Erasmus: *Institutio principis christiani*, in *Opera omnia*, 1703, iv, 561.

*The Utopia of Sir Thomas More* (English and Latin) edited by G. Sampson with an introduction by A. Guthkelch. 1910.

N. Machiavelli: *The Prince*. (Innumerable editions and translations).

H. Jordan: *Luthers Staatsauffassung*. 1917. (Extracts from his works).

Swingli: *De vera et falsa religione*, *Werke* ed. Egli, Finsler und Köhler, iii, (1914), 590 ff.

Calvin: *Institutio*, ed. 1541, cap. xvi.

L. Vives: *De communione rerum*. 1535.

*Vindiciae contra Tyrannos, sive de principis in populum populique in principem legitima potestate*. Stephano Iunio Bruto Celta Auctore. 1580.



- Francisci Hotmani: *Francogallia. Nune quartum ab auctore recognita.* 1586.
- E. de la Boétie: *Discours de la servitude volontaire.* In *Oeuvres complètes* pub. par P. Bonnefon. 1892, pp. 1 ff.
- De Jure Magistratuum in subditos* [by Beza]. 1573.
- The Works of Mr. Richard Hooker*, ed. J. Keble. 3 vols. 1888.
- J. Bodin: *Les six livres de la république.* 1577.
- G. Buchanan: *De Jure Regni apud Scotos.* 1579.
- J. de Mariana: *De rege et regis institutione.* 1599.

#### LITERATURE:

- Lord Acton: "Freedom in Christianity," (1877), in *The History of Freedom and other Essays*, ed. J. N. Figgis and R. V. Lawrence. 1907.
- W. A. Dunning: *A History of Political Theories. Ancient and Medieval.* 1902. *From Luther to Montesquieu.* 1905.
- J. N. Figgis: *Studies in Political Thought from Gerson to Grotius.* 1916.
- J. Mackinnon: *A History of Modern Liberty.* Vol. 2. *The Age of the Reformation.* 1907.
- L. Cardauns: *Die Lehre vom Widerstandsrecht des Volkes gegen die rechtmässige Obrigkeit im Luthertum und im Calvinismus des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts.* 1903.
- R. Chauviré: *Jean Bodin, Auteur de la République.* 1914.
- J. Kreutzer: *Zwinglis Lehre von der Obrigkeit.* 1909.
- F. Meinecke: "Luther über christlichen Geminwesen und christlichen Staat," *Historische Zeitschrift*, Band 121, pp. ff, 1920.
- J. Faulkner: "Luther and Economic Questions," *Papers of the Am. Ch. Hist. Soc.*, 2d ser. vol. ii, 1910.
- K. D. Macmillan: *Protestantism in Germany.* 1917.
- K. Sell: "Der Zusammenhang von Reformation und politischer Freiheit." *Abh. in Theolog. Arbeiten aus dem rhein. wiss. Predigerverein.* Neue Folge. 12. 1910.
- L. H. Waring: *The Political Theories of Martin Luther.* 1910.
- G. von Schulthess-Rechberg: *Luther, Zwingli und Calvin in ihren Ansichten über das Verhältnis von Staat und Kirche.* 1910.
- K. Rieker: "Staat und Kirche nach lutherischer, reformierte

- moderner Anschauung," *Hist. Vierteljahrschrift*, i, 370 ff. 1898.
- E. Troeltsch: *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*. 1912.
- I. L. Osgood: "The Political Ideas of the Puritans." *Political Science Quarterly*, vi, 1891.
- R. Treumann: *Die Monarchomachen. Eine Darstellung der revolutionären Staatslehren des xvi Jahrhundert 1573-1599*. 1885.
- A. Elkan: *Die Publizistik der Bartholomäusnacht und Morneys Vindiciae contra tyrannos*. 1905.
- I. D. Foster: "The Political Theories of the Calvinists," *American Historical Review*, xxi, 481 ff. (1916).
- Paul van Dyke: "The Estates of Pontoise," *English Historical Review*, 1913, pp. 472 ff.
- E. Armstrong: "Political Theory of the Huguenots," *English Historical Review*, iv, 13 ff, 1889.
- K. Gläser: "Beiträge zur Geschichte der politischen Literatur Frankreiches in der zweiten Hälfte des 16. Jahrhundert." *Zeitschrift für Französische Sprache und Literatur*. Vols. 31, 32, 33, 39, 45; 1904-18.
- V. Sohn: "Die Soziallehren Melanchthons," *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxv, pp. 64-76. 1915.
- Lord Acton: *History of Freedom*, pp. 212-31. (Reprint of introduction to L. A. Burd's edition of the Prince of Machiavelli.) 1907.
- John Morley: *Miscellanies*, 4th series. 1908. 1 ff. "Machiavelli."
- Dr. Armaingaud: *Montaigne Pamphlétaire. L'Énigme du Contr'un*. 1910.
- J. Jastrow: "Kopernikus' Münz- und Geld-theorie." *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, xxxviii, 734 ff. 1904.
- K. Kautsky: *Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation*. 1897.
- E. Jenks: *A Short History of English Law*. 1912.
- A. Esmein: *Histoire du Droit Français*. 1905. (And later editions).
- R. Schröder: *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*. 1907.

- Walter Platzhoff: *Die Theorie von der Mordbefugnis der Obrigkeit im XVI. Jahrhundert*. Ebinger's Historische Studien, 1906.
- O. H. Pannkoke: "The Economic Teachings of the Reformation." In a collection of essays entitled *Four Hundred Years*, 1917.
- G. Schmoller: *Zur Geschichte der nationalökonomischen Ansichten in Deutschland während der Reformationsperiode*. 1860.
- F. G. Ward: *Darstellung und Würdigung der Ansichten Luthers über Staat und Gesellschaft*. 1898.

## § 4.

## Science

- J. P. Richter: *The Literary Works of Leonardo da Vinci*. 2 vols. 1883.
- Les Manuscrits de Léonard de Vinci de la bibliothèque de l'Institut*. Publiés en facsimile avec transcription littérale, traduction française . . . par Ch. Ravaissou-Molien. 6 vols. 1881-91.
- Leonardo da Vinci's note-books*; arranged and rendered into English by E. McCurdy. 1906.
- Leonardo de Vinci: *Notes et Dessins sur la Génération*. 1901.
- Léonardo de Vinci: *Feuillets inédits conservés à Windsor*. 22 vols. 1901 ff.
- Istituto di Studi Vinciani*:—*Per il IVo centenario della morte di Leonardo da Vinci*. 1919.
- A. C. Klebs: *Leonardo da Vinci and his anatomical studies*. 1916.
- Hieronymi Cardani: *Opera Omnia*. 1663. 10 vols.
- W. W. R. Ball: *A Short Account of the History of Mathematics*. 1901.
- M. Cantor: *Vorlesungen über Geschichte der Mathematik*. Vol. 2 (1200-1668). 1900.
- H. G. Zeuthen: *Geschichte der Mathematik in 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. 1903.
- Articles, "Algebra" and "Mathematics" in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.
- Maximilien Marie: *Histoire des sciences mathématiques et physiques*, vols. 2 and 3. 1883-4.

- F. Cajori: *History of Mathematics*. 1919.
- David E. Smith: *Rara arithmetica*. A catalogue of the arithmetics written before the year MDCL, with a description of those in the library of G. A. Plimpton. 1908.
- F. Dannemann: *Grundriss einer Geschichte der Naturwissenschaften*. 2 vols. 1902.
- W. A. Loey: *Biology and its makers*. 1915.
- W. A. Loey: *The Main Currents of Zoölogy*. 1918.
- E. L. Greene: *Landmarks of Botanical History*. Part 1. 1909. (Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections, vol. 54).
- J. V. Carus: *Geschichte der Zoölogie bis auf Joh. Müller und Ch. Darwin*. 1872.
- F. Cajori: *A History of Physics in Its Elementary Branches*. 1899.
- Conradi Gesneri: *Historiae Animalium*, libb. iii, 3 vols. 1551-8.
- Wm. Gilbert . . . *on the Loadstone and Magnetic Bodies* . . . a translation by P. F. Mottelay. 1893.
- E. Gerland: *Geschichte der Physik von den ältesten Zeiten bis zum Ausgange des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*. 1913. (Work of high philosophical and scientific value).
- C. Brown: *A History of Chemistry from the Earliest Times Till the Present Day*. 1913.
- F. J. Moore: *A History of Chemistry*. 1918.
- T. E. Thorpe: *A History of Chemistry*. 2 vols. 1909-10.
- Quaestiones Novae in Libellum de Sphaera Johannis de Sacro Bosco, collectae ab Ariele Bicardo*. Wittenberg, 1550. (Library of Mr. G. A. Plimpton, New York).
- S. Günther: *Geschichte der Erdkunde*. 1904.
- Articles, "Geography" and "Map" in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.
- L. Gallois: *Les géographes allemands de la Renaissance*, 1890.
- N. Copernici *De Revolutionibus orbium cælestium libri vi*. (First edition 1543; I use the edition of Basle, 1566).
- L. Prowe: *Nikolaus Copernicus*. 3 vols. 1883-4. (Standard).
- Vohlwill: "Melanchthon und Kopernicus," in *Mitteilungen zur Geschichte der Medizin und der Naturwissenschaften*, iii, 260, 1904.
- Author on Copernicus*. Bindseil: *Lutheri Colloquia*. 3 vols. 1863-66, vol. ii, p. 149. (This is the best text; the stronger

form of the same saying, in which Luther called Copernicus a fool, seems to have been retouched by Aurifaber).

A. D. White: *The Warfare of Science and Theology*, 2 vols. 1896. Vol. i, pp. 114 ff.

A. Müller: *Nikolaus Copernicus*. 1898.

Dorothy Stimson: *The Gradual Acceptance of the Copernican Theory of the Universe*. 1917. (Excellent).

W. W. Bryant: *History of Astronomy*. 1907.

Article, "Navigation," in *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

## § 5.

## Philosophy

The Works of Luther, Melanchthon, Calvin, Zwingli, &c.

*The Workes of Sir Thomas More*, 1557. (Passage quoted, p. 329h).

*De Trinitatis Erroribus per M. Servetum*. (Printed, 1531; I use the MS copy at Harvard).

*M. Serveti Christianismi Restitutio*. (I use the MS copy at Harvard).

E. F. K. Müller: *Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche*. 1903.

*Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, translated by T. A. Buckley. 1851.

Thomas Cajetan's commentary on Aquinas, in the standard edition of the *Summa*, 1880 ff.

*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, translated into English by J. Donovan. 1829.

Altensteig: *Lexicon Theologicum*. 1583.

A. Harnack: *A History of Dogma*, translated from the third edition by N. Buchanan. 7 vols. 1901.

A. Harnack: *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*. 1910. Vol. iii.

E. Troeltsch: *Geschichte der christlichen Religion*. 1909 (Kultur der Gegenwart).

R. M. Jones: *Spiritual Reformers of the 16th and 17th Centuries*. 1914.

O. Ritschl: *Dogmengeschichte des Protestantismus*, i, ii Hälfte, 1912.

A. C. McGiffert: *Protestant Thought before Kant*. 1911.

J. Gottschick: *Luther's Theologie*. 1914.



- Francis Bacon: *Novum Organum*, Bk. I, aphorisms xv, lxv, and lxxix; Essays i, (Truth), iii, (of Unity in Religion), xxxv, (Prophecy). *Advancement of Learning*, Bk. ix.
- Montaigne's *Essays*, passim (numerous editions and excellent English translation by Florio).
- W. Lyly: *Euphues and Atheos* (edited by E. Arber, 1904).
- R. Ascham: *The Schoolmaster*. 1761.
- Janssen-Pastor ii, 461f (on the Godless Painters of Nuremberg; cf. also M. Thausing: A. Dürer, translated by F. A. Eaton, 1882, ii, 248 f.)
- François Rabelais: *Oeuvres* (numerous editions and translations).
- J. M. Robertson: *A Short History of Freethought*. 2 vols. 1906.
- Colloque de Jean Bodin des Secrets cachez et des Choses Sublimes*. Traduction française du Colloquium Heptaplomeres, par R. Chauviré. 1914.
- F. von Bezold: "Jean Bodins Colloquium Heptaplomeres und der Atheismus des 16. Jahrhunderts," *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxiii, 260-315.
- Ordani Bruni Opera, ed. Fiorentino. 3 vols. 1879-91.
- Giordano Brunos *Gesammelte Werke*, verdeutscht und erläutert von L. Kuhlenbeck. 6 vols. 1907-10.
- W. Boulting: *Giordano Bruno: His Life, Thought and Martyrdom*. (1916).
- L. Kuhlenbeck: *Giordano Bruno, seine Lehre von Gott, von der Unsterblichkeit und von der Willensfreiheit*. 1913.
- W. Pater: *Gaston de la Tour*. 1896.
- J. R. Charbonnel: *L'Éthique de Giordano Bruno et le deuxième dialogue de Spaccio*, traduction, 1919.
- J. Owen: *The Skeptics of the Italian Renaissance*. 1893.
- J. Owen: *The Skeptics of the French Renaissance*. 1893.
- A. M. Fairbairn: "Tendencies of European Thought in the Age of the Reformation," *Cambridge Modern History*, ii, chap. 19.
- Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*. (Kultur der Gegenwart, Teil i, Abt. V.) 1909. W. Windelband: *Die neuere Philosophie*.

- E. Cassirer: *Das Erkenntnisproblem in der Philosophie und Wissenschaft der neuen Zeit*. Vol. i. 1911. (Excellent. First edition, 1906-7).
- R. Adamson: *A Short History of Logic*. 1911.
- H. Höffding: *A History of Modern Philosophy*. English translation. 2 vols. 1900.
- R. Eucken: *The Problem of Human Life as Viewed by the Great Thinkers*. English translation. 1909.
- J. M. Baldwin: *Dictionary of Philosophy and Psychology*. 3 vols. 1901-5.
- J. R. Charbonnel: *La pensée italienne au XVI<sup>e</sup> siècle*. 1919.
- A. Bonilla y San Martin: *Luis Vives y la filosofía del renacimiento*. 1903.

## CHAPTER 4

### THE TEMPER OF THE TIMES

#### § 1. Tolerance and Intolerance

- Lord Acton: *The History of Freedom*. 1907. "The Protestant Theory of Persecution," pp. 150-187. (Essay written in 1862).
- F. Ruffini: *Religious Liberty*, translated by J. P. Heyes. 1912.
- N. Paulus: *Protestantismus und Toleranz*. 1912.
- G. L. Burr: "Anent the Middle Ages." *American Historical Review*. 1913, pp. 710-726.
- P. Wappler: *Die Stellung Kursachsens und Philipps von Hessen zur Täuferbewegung*. 1910.
- Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, ix, s. v. "Persecution."
- S. Castellion: *Traité des Hérétiques*. A savoir, si on les doit persécuter. Ed. A. Olivet. Genève. 1913.
- P. Wappler: *Inquisition und Ketzerprozess zu Zwickau*. 1908.
- J. A. Faulkner: "Luther and Toleration," *Papers of American Church History Society*, Second Series, vol. iv, pp. 129 ff. 1914.
- K. Völker: *Toleranz und Intoleranz im Zeitalter der Reformation*. 1912.
- W. E. H. Lecky: *A History of the Rise and Influence of the*

- Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*. 2 vols. 1865. chapter iv, "Persecution" (in vols. 1 and 2 both).
- Erasmi opera*, 1703, ix, 904 ff. Proposition iii.
- H. Hermelinck: *Der Toleranzgedanke*. 1908.
- The Workes of Sir Thomas More*, 1557, pp. 274 ff. (A Dialogue of Sir Thomas More, 1528).
- Montaigne: *Essays*, Book ii, no. xix.
- A. J. Klein: *Intolerance in the Reign of Elizabeth*. 1917.
- R. Lewin: *Luther's Stellung zu den Juden*. 1911.
- R. H. Murray: *Erasmus and Luther: their attitude to Toleration*. 1920.

## § 2. Witchcraft

- Papers of the American Historical Association*, iv, pp. 237-66.
- Bibliography of witchcraft by G. L. Burr.
- N. Paulus: *Hexenwahn und Hexenprozess, vornehmlich im 16. Jahrhundert*. 1910.
- G. L. Burr: *The Witch Persecutions*. Translations and Reprints issued by the University of Pennsylvania, vol. 3, no. 4, 1897.
- G. L. Burr: *The Fate of Dietrich Flade*. 1891.
- J. Hansen: *Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess im Mittelalter, und die Entstehung der grossen Hexenverfolgung*. 1900.
- F. von Bezold: "Jean Bodin als Okkultist und seine Demonomanie." *Historische Zeitschrift*, cv. 1 ff. (1910).
- Gosson: *The School of Abuse* (1578), ed. E. Arber, 1906, p. 60.
- De Praestigiis demonum . . . authore Joanne Wiero . . .* 1564.
- Johannis Wieri: *De lamiis*. 1582.
- Reginald Scott: *The Discoverie of Witchcraft, wherein the Lewde dealing of Witches and Witchmongers is notably detected . . . whereunto is added a Treatise upon the Nature and Substance of Spirits and Devils*. 1584. Reprinted by B. Nicholson, 1886.
- W. Notestein: *A History of Witchcraft in England 1558-1718*. 1911.
- W. E. H. Lecky: *A History of the Rise and Influence of the*

*Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*. 2 vols. 1865. Vol. 1, chaps. i, and ii.

Montaigne: *Essays*, vol. iii, no. xi.

H. C. Lea: *A History of the Inquisition in the Middle Ages*. Vol. iii, 392 ff.

G. L. Kittredge: "A Case of Witchcraft," *American Historical Review*, xxiii, pp. 1 ff, 1917.

C. Mirbt: *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus*. 1911. p. 182. (Bull, Summis desiderantes).

G. Roskoff: *Geschichte des Teufels*. 1869.

A. Graf: *Il diavolo*. 1889.

H. C. Lea: *The Inquisition in Spain*, 1907, vol. iv, chaps. 8 and 9.

*Statutes of the Realm*, 5 Eliz. 16: An Act agaynst Inchantmentes and Witchcraftes. (1562-3).

T. de Cauzons: *La Magie et la Sorcellerie en France*. 4 vols. (1911).

E. Klinger: *Luther und der deutsche Volksaberglaube*. 1912. (*Palaestra*, vol. 56).

### § 3.

### Education

*Album Academiae Vitebergensis 1502-1602*, Band I, ed. K. E. Förstemann, 1841. Band ii, 1895. Band iii Indices, 1905. (Reprint of vol. i, 1906).

J. C. H. Weissenborn: *Akten der Erfurter Universität*. 3 vols. 1884.

G. Buchanan: "Anent the Reformation of the University of St. Andros," in *Buchanan's Vernacular Writings*, ed. P. Hume Brown, 1892.

*The Statutes of the Faculty of Arts and of the Faculty of Theology at the Period of the Reformation, of St. Andrews' University*, ed. R. K. Hannay, 1910.

K. Hartfelder: *Melanchthoniana pædagogica*. 1895.

F. V. N. Painter: *Luther on Education*, including a historical introduction and a translation of the Reformer's two most important educational treatises. 1889.

*Mandament der Keyserlijcker Maiesteit, vuytghegeven int Jaer xlvi*. Louvain. 1546. (100 facsimiles printed for A. M.

- Huntington at the De Vinne Press, N. Y., 1896. Contains lists of books allowed in schools in the Netherlands).
- C. Borgeaud: *Histoire de l'Université de Genève*. 2 vols. 1900, 1909.
- J. M. Höfer: *Die Stellung des Des. Erasmus und J. L. Vives zur Pädagogik des Quintilian*. (Erlangen Dissertation). 1910.
- F. Watson: *Vives and the Renaissance education of Women*. 1912.
- P. Monroe: *Cyclopedia of education*. 5 vols. 1912-3.
- K. A. Schmid: *Geschichte der Erziehung vom Anfang bis auf unserer Zeit*. 5 vols. in 7. 1884-1902. (Standard).
- A. Zimmermann: *Die Universitäten Englands im 16. Jahrhundert*. 1889.
- A. Zimmermann: *England's "öffentliche Schulen" von der Reformation bis zur Gegenwart*, 1892 (Stimmen aus Maria-Lach. vol. 56).
- F. P. Graves: *A History of Education during the Middle Ages and the Transition to Modern Times*. 1910.
- "Die Frequenz der deutschen Universitäten in früherer Zeit," *Deutsches Wochenblatt*, 1897, pp. 391 ff.
- P. Monroe: *A Text-Book of the History of Education*. 1905. (Standard text-book).
- W. S. Monroe: *A Bibliography of Education*. 1897.
- G. Mertz: *Das Schulwesen der deutschen Reformation*. 1902.
- F. Paulsen: *Geschichte des gelehrten Unterrichts in Deutschland*. 2 vols. 1896-7.
- W. Sohm: *Die Schule Johann Sturms*. 1912.
- J. Ficker: *Die Anfänge der akademischen Studien in Strassburg*. 1912.
- Shakespeare's England*, 1916. 2 vols. ch. 8 "Education" by Sir J. E. Sandys.
- A. Roersch: *L' Humanisme belge à l' époque de la Renaissance*. 1910.
- Sir T. Elyot: *The booke named the governour*. 1531. (New edition by H. H. S. Croft. 2 vols. 1880).
- Melanchthonis opera omnia*, xi, 12 ff. "Declamatio de corrigendis adolescentiæ studies." (1518).



- R. Ascham: *The Schole Master*. 1571. (I use the reprint in the English Works of R. Ascham, ed. J. Bennet, 1761).
- M. Fournier: *Les Statuts et Privilèges des Universités françaises depuis leur fondation jusqu'en 1789*. 4 vols. 1890-4.
- F. Bacon: *The Advancement of Learning*, Book ii.
- Elizabethan Oxford: reprints of rare tracts ed. by C. Plumer. 1887.
- Grace book*  $\Delta$  containing records of the University of Cambridge 1542-89, ed. by J. Venn. 1910.
- Registres des procès-verbaux de la Faculté de théologie de Paris*, pub. par A. Clerval. Tome I. 1917. (1505-23).
- J. H. Lupton: *A Life of John Colet*, new ed. 1909. (First printed in 1887. On St. Paul's School, pp. 169, 271 ff.)
- W. H. Woodward: *Des. Erasmus concerning the Aim and Method of Education*. 1904. (Fine work).
- F. P. Graves: *Peter Ramus and the Educational Reformation of the 16th Century*. 1912.
- Encyclopædia Britannica*, articles "Universities" and "Schools."
- Altamira y Crevea: *Historia de España*, iii, 532 ff. (1913).
- F. Gribble: *The Romance of the Cambridge Colleges*. (1913).
- J. B. Mullinger: *A History of the University of Cambridge*. 1888.
- G. C. Brodrick: *A History of the University of Oxford*. 1886.
- C. Headlam: *The Story of Oxford*. 1907.
- W. H. Woodward: *Studies in Education during the Age of the Renaissance 1400-1600*.
- A. Bonilla y San Martin: *Luis Vives y la filosofía del renacimiento*. 1903.
- A. Lefranc: *Histoire du Collège de France depuis ses origines jusqu' à la fin du premier empire*. 1893.
- P. Feret: *La Faculté de Théologie de Paris. Époque Moderne*. 7 vols. 1900-10.
- W. Friedensburg: *Geschichte der Universität Wittenberg*. 1918.

## § 4.

## Art

Very fine reproductions of the works of the principal painters of the time are published in separate volumes of the series, *Klassiker der Kunst in Gesamtausgaben*, Deutsche Ver

ngs-Anstalt, Stuttgart und Leipzig. A brief list of standard criticisms of art, many of them well illustrated, follows:

- K. Woermann: *Geschichte der Kunst aller Zeiten und Völker*. Band 4. 1919.
- S. Reinach: *Apollo*. 1907. (Also English translation. Marvelously compressed and sound criticism).
- A. Symonds: *The Italian Renaissance*. The Fine Arts. 1888.
- Pastor: *History of the Popes*. (Much on art at Rome, *passim*).
- B. Berenson: *North Italian Painters of the Renaissance*. 1907.
- B. Berenson: *Central Italian Painters of the Renaissance*. 1897.
- B. Berenson: *The Venetian Painters of the Renaissance*. 1902.
- B. Berenson: *The Florentine Painters of the Renaissance*. 1903.
- Giorgio Vasari: *Lives of the Most Eminent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, newly translated by G. du C. de Vere. 10 vols. 1912-14. (Other editions).
- R. Lanciani: *The Golden Days of the Renaissance in Rome*. 1907.
- E. Müntz: *Histoire de l'art pendant la Renaissance*. 3 vols. 1889-95.
- Crowe and G. Cavalcaselle: *History of Italian Painting*. 1903 ff.
- Dimier: *French Painting in the Sixteenth Century*. 1904.
- F. Freeman: *Italian Sculptors of the Renaissance*. 1902.
- I. Janitschek: *Geschichte der deutschen Malerei*. 1890.
- A. Dickenson: *German Masters of Art*. 1914.
- E. Bertaux: *Rome de l'avènement de Jules II à nos jours*. 1908.
- M. Reymond: *L'Education de Léonard*. 1910.
- V. Pater: "Leonardo da Vinci," in the volume called *The Renaissance*, 1878. (Though much attacked this is, in my opinion, the best criticism of Leonardo).
- S. Freud: *Leonardo da Vinci*. 1910.
- V. von Seidlitz: *Leonardo da Vinci*. 2 vols. 1909. (Excellent).
- O. Svald Sirén: *Leonardo da Vinci*. 1916.
- Leonardo da Vinci: *A treatise on painting*, translated from the Italian by J. F. Rigaud. London. 1897.

- C. J. Holmes: *Leonardo da Vinci. Proceedings of the British Academy*. 1919.
- E. Müntz: *Raphael, sa vie, son oeuvre et son temps*. 1881.
- W. Pater: "Raphael," in *Miscellaneous Studies*, 1913. (First written 1892; fine criticism).
- Edward McCurdy: *Raphael Santi*. 1917.
- H. Grimm: *Life of Michael Angelo*, tr. by F. E. Bunnètt. 2 vols. New ed. 1906.
- Crowe and Cavalcasselle: *Life and Times of Titian*. 1877.
- H. Thode: *Michelangelo und das Ende der Renaissance*. 5 vols. 1902-13.
- L. Dorez: "Nouvelles recherches sur Michel-Ange et son entourage," *Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes*. Vol. 77, pp. 448 ff. (1916), vol. 78, pp. 179 ff. (1917).
- Romain Roland: *Vie de Michel-Ange*. 1913.
- The Sonnets of Michael Angelo Buonarroti*, translated into English by J. A. Symonds. (My copy, Venice, has no date).
- R. W. Emerson: *Essay on Michaelangelo*.
- A. Dürer's *Schriftliche Nachlass*, ed. E. Heidrich. 1908.
- M. Thausing: *A. Dürer*. 1876. (English translation from 1st ed. by F. A. Eaton. 1882).
- Albrecht Dürers Niederländische Reise*, hg. von J. Veth und S. Müller. 2 vols. 1918.
- A. B. Chamberlain: *Hans Holbein the Younger*. 2 vols. 1913.
- A. Michel: *Histoire de l'art depuis les premiers temps chrétiens jusqu'à nos jours*. 3 vols. 1905-8.
- C. H. Moore: *The Character of Renaissance Architecture*. 1905.
- R. Bloomfield: *A History of French Architecture from the Reign of Charles VIII till the death of Mazarin*. 2 vols. 1911.

## § 5.

*Belles Lettres*

Note: The works of the humanists, theologians, biblical and classical scholars, historians, publicists and philosophers have been dealt with in other sections of this bibliography. Representative poets, dramatists and writers of fiction for the century (up to but not including the Age of Shakespeare in England or of Henry IV in France) are the following:

Italian: Ariosto, A. F. Grazzini, M. Bandello, T. Tasso, Berni, Guarini.

French: Margaret of Navarre, C. Marot, Rabelais, Joachim du Bellay, Ronsard, Montaigne.

English: Lyndesay, Skelton, Wyatt, Surrey, anonymous poets in Tottel's Miscellany, Sidney, E. Spenser, Donne, Lyly, Heywood, Kyd, Peele, Greene, Lodge, Nash, Marlowe.

German: Hans Sachs, Fischart, T. Murner, anonymous Till Eulenspiegel and Faustbuch, B. Waldis.

Spanish: The Picaresque novel, *La vida de Lazarillo de Tormes y de sus fortunas y adversidades*.

Portuguese: Camoens.

As it is not my purpose to give even a sketch of literary history, but merely to illustrate the temper of the times from the contemporary belles lettres, only a few suggestive works of criticism can be mentioned here.

L. Hallam: *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries*. 1838-9. (Old, but still useful).

A. Symonds: *Italian Literature*. 1888.

E. Lanson: *Histoire de la littérature française*. 1906.

E. H. C. Wright: *A History of French Literature*. 1912.

E. Thomas: *A History of German Literature*. 1909.

E. Wolff: *Faust und Luther*. 1912.

*The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. iii, Renaissance and Reformation. 1908.

J. Jusserand: *Histoire Littéraire du Peuple Anglais*. Tome ii, De la Renaissance à la Guerre Civile. 1904. (Also English translation; a beautiful work).

Winifred Smith: *The Commedia dell' Arte*. 1912. (Notable).

E. Tilley: *The Literature of the French Renaissance*. 2 vols. 1904.

## CHAPTER 5

### THE REFORMATION INTERPRETED

The purpose of the following list is not to give the titles of general histories of the Reformation, but of those books

and articles in which some noteworthy contribution has been made to the philosophical interpretation of the events. Many an excellent work of pure narrative character, and many of those dealing with some particular phase of the Reformation, are omitted. All the noteworthy historical works published prior to 1600 are listed in the bibliography to Chapter 3, section 2, and are not repeated here. The chronological order is here adopted, save that all the works of each writer are grouped together. In every case I enter the book under the year in which it first appeared, adding in parentheses the edition, if another, which I have used.

Francis Bacon (1561–1626): *Essay lviii*; also *Essays i, iii, xxxv*; *Novum Organum Bk. i, aphorisms xv and lxv*; *Advancement of Learning, Bk. ix, and i*.

Jacques-Auguste de Thou (Thuanus): *Historiae sui temporis*. 1604–20.

Hugo Grotius: *Annales et historiae de rebus belgicis*. 1657. (Written 1611 ff).

William Camden: *Annales Rerum Anglicarum et Hibernicarum regnante Elizabetha*. Pars. I, 1615; Pars II, 1625.

Agrippa d' Aubigné: *Histoire Universelle*. 1616–20.

Paolo Sarpi: *Istoria del Concilio Tridentino*. 1619. (P. Sarpi: *Histoire du Concile du Trente*, French translation by Amelot de la Houssaie. 1699).

Arrigo Caterino Davila: *Storia delle guerre civili di Francia*. 1630.

Giulio Bentivoglio: *Guerra di Fiandria*. 1632–39.

Famiano Strada: *De bello belgico decades duo*. 1632–47.

François Eudes, [called] de Mézeray: *Histoire de France*. 1643–51.

David Calderwood (1575–1650): *History of the Kirk of Scotland*, ed. T. Thompson, 1842–9.

Lord Herbert of Cherbury: *Life and Reign of Henry VIII*. 1649.

Thomas Fuller: *Church History*, 1655. (Ed. Brewer, 6 vols. 1845).

J. Harrington: *Oceana*, 1656. (Harrington's Works, 1700, pp. 69, 388).



- Sforza Pallavicino: *Istoria del Concilio di Trento*. 1656-7.
- Annales ecclesiastici . . . auctore Reynaldo*, ed. J. D. Mansi. Tomi 33-35. Lucae. 1755. (Oderic Reynaldus, who died 1671, was a continuator of Baronius, covering the period in church history 1198-1565).
- Jean Claude: *Défense de la Réformation*. . . . 1673. (English translation: *An historical defense of the Reformation*. 1683).
- Gilbert Burnet: *History of the Reformation of the Church of England*. 3 vols. 1679, 1681, 1715. (Ed. by Pocock, 6 vols. 1865ff).
- Louis Maimbourg: *Histoire du Luthéranisme*. 1680.
- Pierre Jurieu: *Histoire du Calvinisme et celle du Papisme mises en parallèle*. 1683. (English translation, 2 vols. 1823).
- Veit Ludwig von Seckendorf: *Commentarius historicus et apologeticus de Lutherismo*. 1688-92.
- Jacques Benigne Bossuet: *Histoire des variations des églises protestantes*. 1688. (I have used the editions of 1812 and 1841).
- Pierre Bayle: *Dictionnaire historique et critique*, 1697., s. v. "Luther," "Calvin," &c.
- Gabriel Daniel: *Histoire de France*. 1703.
- Jeremy Collier: *Ecclesiastical History*, 2 vols. 1708-14. (ed. Lathbury, 9 vols. 1852).
- Capin Thoyras: *Histoire d'Angleterre*. 1723ff.
- Johann Lorenz Mosheim: *Institutiones historiae christianae recentiores*. 1741.
- Montesquieu: *Esprit des Lois*, 1748, Livre xxiv, chaps. 2, 5, 25; Livre xxv, chap. 2, 6, 11.
- Frederick II (called The Great) of Prussia: *De la Superstition et de la Religion*. 1749. (Oeuvres, 1846, i, 204 ff).
- Voltaire: *Essai sur les mœurs et l'esprit des nations, et sur les principaux faits de l'histoire depuis Charlemagne jusqu'à Louis XIII*. 1754. (Cf. also a passage in his *Dictionnaire philosophique*).
- David Hume: *History of England from the Invasion of Julius Caesar to the Revolution of 1688*. The volumes on the Tudor period came out in 1759.
- William Robertson: *A History of Scotland*. 1759.

- William Robertson: *History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V.* 1769.
- Edward Gibbon: *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire.* 1776–88. (On the Reformation, chap. liv, end).  
*Encyclopédie*, 1778, s. v. "Luthéranisme." (Anonymous article).
- Johann Gottfried von Herder: *Das Weimarische Gesangbuch*, 1778, Vorrede.
- Herder: *Briefe das Studium der Theologie betreffend*, 1784. (Sämtliche Werke, Teil 14).
- Herder: *Briefe zur Beförderung der Humanität*, 1793–7. (Sämtliche Werke, Teil 14).
- Michael Ignaz Schmidt: *Geschichte der Deutschen.* Aeltere Geschichte (to 1544), 1778 ff. Neuere Geschichte (1544–1660), 1785 ff.
- Jakob Gottlieb Planck: *Geschichte des protestantischen Lehrbegriffs*, 6 vols. 1783–1800.
- [M. J. A. N. de Caritat, Marquis] De Condorcet: *Esquisse d'un tableau historique des Progrès de l' Esprit humain.* 1794. (I use the fourth edition, 1798, pp. 200 ff.)
- F. A. de Chateaubriand: *Essai historique sur les Révolutions*, 1797. (Oeuvres, 1870).
- Chateaubriand: *Analyse raisonnée de l' histoire de France.* (Oeuvres, 1865, Tome 8).
- Friedrich von Hardenberg (called Novalis): *Die Christenheit oder Europa*, 1799 (Novalis' Schriften hg. von Minor, 1907, Band ii. Also English translation).
- Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832): *Sämtliche Werke*, Jubiläumsausgabe, no date, Stuttgart and Berlin, i, 242 and ii, 279, and other obiter dicta for which see the excellent index. See also *Gespräche mit Eckermann*, 1832, English translation in Bohn's library, p. 568.
- Friedrich Schiller: *Geschichte des Abfalles der Vereinigten Niederlande von der spanischen Regierung.* 1788. (2nd ed., much changed, 1801; translation in Bohn's Library). Cf. also Schiller's letter to Goethe, Sept. 17, 1800, in Schiller's *Briefe*, hg. von F. Jonas, 1895, vi, 200.
- Christoph Martin Wieland (1733–1813). His opinion, in 1801 is given in *Diary &c of Henry Crabb Robinson*, ed. T.

- Sadler, 3 vols., 1869, i, 109, and in "Charakteristik Luthers," in *Pantheon der Deutschen*, 1794.
- Charles de Villers: *Essai sur l'esprit et l'influence de la Réforme de Luther*. 1803. (English translation by James Mill, 1805).
- William Roscoe: *Life and Pontificate of Leo X*. 1805.
- J. G. Fichte: *Reden an die deutsche Nation*, 1808. Nr. 6.
- Mme. de Staël: *De l'Allemagne*. 1813.
- E. M. Arndt: *Ansichten und Aussichten der deutschen Geschichte*. 1814.
- Arndt: *Vom Worte und vom Kirchenliede*. 1819.
- Arndt: *Christliches und Türkisches*. 1828, pp. 255 ff.
- Arndt: *Vergleichende Völkergeschichte*. 1814.
- Friedrich von Schlegel: *Geschichte der alten und neuen Literatur*. 1815. (Sämtliche Werke, 1822, ii, 244 ff).
- Schlegel: *Philosophie der Geschichte*. 1829. (English translation in Bohn's Library).
- Joseph de Maistre: *De l'église gallicane*. 1820, cap. 2. (Oeuvres, 1884, ii, 3 ff).
- De Maistre: *Lettres sur l'Inquisition espagnole*. 1815 ff. (Oeuvres ii).
- John Lingard: *History of England*, vols. 4, 5, 1820 ff.
- G. W. F. Hegel: *Philosophie der Geschichte*. Lectures delivered first 1822-3, published as vol. ix of his Werke by E. Gans, 1837. (English translation by J. Sibree, 1857, in Bohn's Library).
- Leopold von Ranke: *Geschichte der romanischen und germanischen Völker von 1494-1535*. Band i, (bis 1514). 1824. Appendix: Zur Kritik neuerer Geschichtschreiber.
- Ranke: *Die römischen Päpste, ihre Kirche und ihr Staat im XVI. und XVII. Jahrhundert*. 1834-6. (Many editions and translations of this and other works of Ranke.)
- Ranke: *Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation*. 1839-47.
- Ranke: *Zwölf Bücher Preussischer Geschichte*. Band i und ii, 1874.
- Ranke: *Die Osmanen und die Spanische Monarchie im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert*. 1877.

- C. H. de Rouvroy, Comte de Saint-Simon: *Nouveau Christianisme*, Oeuvres, 1869, vii, 100 ff. (written 1825).
- Henry Hallam: *Constitutional History of England from the accession of Henry VII to the death of George II*. 1827.
- Hallam: *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the 15th, 16th and 17th Centuries*. 1837-9.
- A. Thierry: *Vingt-cinq lettres sur l'histoire de France*. 1827.
- François-Pierre-Guillaume Guizot: *Histoire de la civilisation en Europe*. 1828. (English transl. by Hazlitt, 1846).
- Guizot: *Histoire de la civilisation en France*. 4 vols. 1830.
- Philipp Marheineke: *Geschichte der deutschen Reformation*. 4 vols. 1831-4.
- Heinrich Leo: *Geschichte der Niederlanden*. 2 vols. 1832-5.
- Leo: *Lehrbuch der Universalgeschichte*, 6 vols. 1835-44.
- Friedrich von Raumer: *Geschichte Europas seit dem Ende des 15. Jahrhundert*. 1832-50.
- A. Vinet: *Moralistes des 16. and 17. siècles*. 1859 (Lectures given 1832-47).
- H. Martin: *Histoire de France*. 1833-6.
- Heinrich Heine: *Zur Geschichte der Religion und Philosophie in Deutschland*. 1834.
- Jules Michelet: *Mémoires de Luther écrits par lui-même, traduits et mis en ordre*. 1835.
- Michelet et Quinet: *Les Jésuites*. 1842.
- Michelet: *Histoire de France*, vols. 8-10, 1855 ff.
- J. H. Merle d'Aubigné: *Histoire de la Réformation du 16. siècle*. 5 vols. 1835-53. (English translation, 1846).
- Thomas Babington Macauley: "On Ranke's History of the Popes," 1840, published in his *Essays*, 1842. There are also remarks on the effect of the Reformation in his *History of England*, 1848 ff.
- John Carl Ludwig Gieseler: *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. Band iii, Abteilung 1, 1840. (Many later editions, and an English translation.)
- Jaime Balmes: *El protestantismo comparado con el catolicismo en sus relaciones con la civilizacion Europea*. 4 vols. 1842-4. (English translation as, *Protestantism and Catholicism compared*, 2d ed. 1851).
- Thomas Carlyle: *Heroes and Hero-worship*. 1842.

- Philarète Chasle: "La Renaissance sensuelle: Luther, Rabelais, Skelton, Folengo." *Revue des deux Mondes*, March, 1842.
- Edgar Quinet: *Le génie des religions*. 1842.
- Quinet: (see Michelet).
- Quinet: *Le Christianisme et la Révolution française*. 1845.
- Johann Joseph Ignaz von Döllinger: *Die Reformation*. 3 vols. 1846-8.
- Döllinger: *Luther, eine Skizze*. 1851.
- Döllinger: *Kirche und Kirchen*. 1861, p. 386.
- Döllinger: *Vorträge über die Wiedervereinigungsversuche zwischen den christlichen Kirchen und die Aussichten einer künftigen Union*. 1872.
- F. C. Baur: *Lehrbuch der christlichen Dogmengeschichte*. 1847.
- Baur: *Die Epochen der kirchlichen Geschichtschreibung*. 1852.
- Baur: *Geschichte der christlichen Kirche*, Band iv, 1863.
- E. Forcade: "La Réforme et la Révolution," *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Feb. 1849.
- William Corbett: *A History of the Protestant "Reformation" in England and Ireland, showing how that event has impoverished and degraded the main body of the People in these countries*. 1852.
- Napoléon Roussel: *Les nations catholiques et les nations protestantes comparées sous le triple rapport du bien-être, des lumières et de la moralité*. 1854.
- William H. Prescott: *History of the Reign of Philip II, King of Spain*. 1855-72.
- John Lothrop Motley: *The Rise of the Dutch Republic*. 1855.
- Motley: *History of the United Netherlands from the death of William the Silent to the Synod of Dort*. 1860-7.
- Motley: *Life and Death of John of Barneveldt*. 1874.
- James Anthony Froude: *History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth*. (Later: *To the Spanish Armada*). 1856-70.
- Froude: *Short Studies on Great Subjects*. 1867-83.
- Froude: *The Divorce of Catharine of Aragon*. 1891.
- Froude: *The Life and Letters of Erasmus*. 1894.
- Froude: *Lectures on the Council of Trent*. 1896.



- Henry Thomas Buckle: *History of Civilization in England*. 1857–61.
- Paul de Lagarde: "Ueber das Verhältniss des deutschen Staates zu Theologie, Kirche und Religion." *Deutsche Schriften*, 1886, pp. 48 ff. (Written in 1859, first printed 1873).
- David Friedrich Strauss: *Ulrich von Hutten*. 1858.
- Gustav Freytag: *Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit*. 1859–62.
- Ferdinand Gregorovius: *Geschichte der Stadt Rom im Mittelalter*. 1859–71.
- Lord Acton: Many essays and articles, beginning about 1860, mostly collected in his *History of Freedom and Other Essays*, 1906, and *Historical Essays and Studies*, 1907.
- Acton: *Lectures on Modern History*. 1906. (I use the 1912 edition; the lectures were delivered in 1899–1901).
- Acton: *Letters to Mary Gladstone*, ed. H. Paul, 1904.
- Jacob Burckhart: *Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien*. 1860. (English translation by S. G. C. Middlemore, 1878). Twentieth ed. by L. Geiger, 1919.
- W. Stubbs: *Lectures on European History*. 1904. (Delivered 1860–70).
- François Laurent: *Études sur l'histoire de l'humanité*. 18 vols. Vol. viii: *La Réforme*. (No date, circa 1862). Vol. xvii: *La Religion de l'avenir*. 1870. Vol. xviii: *Philosophie de l'histoire*. 1870. (pp. 340 ff).
- John William Draper: *History of the Intellectual Development of Europe*. 1863.
- Draper: *History of the Conflict of Science and Religion*. 1874.
- W. E. H. Lecky: *History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe*. 1865.
- K. P. W. Maurenbrecher: *Karl V und die deutschen Protestanten*. 1865.
- Maurenbrecher: *England im Reformationszeitalter*. 1866.
- Maurenbrecher: *Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit*. 1874.
- Maurenbrecher: *Geschichte der katholischen Reformation*. 1880.
- Henry Charles Lea: *Superstition and Force*. 1866.
- Lea: *Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*. 1867.

- Lea: *Chapters from the Religious History of Spain connected with the Inquisition*. 1890.
- Lea: *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church*. 1896.
- Lea: *History of the Inquisition in Spain*. 1906-7.
- Lea: "The Eve of the Reformation," *Cambridge Modern History*, ii, 1902.
- Ludwig Häusser: *Geschichte des Zeitalters der Reformation*. 1867-8.
- Frederic Seebohm: *The Oxford Reformers*, 1867.
- Seebohm: *The Era of the Protestant Revolution*. 1874.
- H. H. Milman: *Savenarola, Erasmus and other Essays*. 1870.
- Eichhoff: *Dr. Martin Luther: 100 Stimmen namhafter Männer aus 4 Jahrhunderten*. 1872.
- George Park Fisher: *The Reformation*. 1873. (New ed. 1906).
- John Richard Green: *Short History of the English People*. 1874.
- Green: *History of the English People*, 4 vols. 1877-80.
- John Addington Symonds: *The Renaissance in Italy*, 7 vols. 1875-86.
- Symonds: "Renaissance," article in *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 9th, 10th, 11th ed.
- Johannes Janssen: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters*, 1876-88. (Twentieth ed. of vols. 1, 2; eighteenth ed. of vols. 3-8, by L. Pastor, 1913 ff).
- Emile de Laveleye: *Le protestantisme et le catholicisme dans leurs rapports avec la liberté et la prospérité des peuples*, 1875.
- Richard Watson Dixon: *History of the Church of England from the abolition of the Roman jurisdiction*, 6 vols. 1878-1902.
- Friedrich Nietzsche: *Menschliches, Allzumenschliches*. 1878, p. 200.
- Nietzsche: *Die fröhliche Wissenschaft*. 1882, §§ 35, 148, 149, 385. (And other obiter dicta, cf. *Werke*. vii, 401).
- Pasquale Villari: *Niccolò Machiavelli e i suoi tempi*. 1878. (English transl., 1891).

- Ludwig (von) Pastor: *Die kirchliche Unionsbestrebungen unter Karl V*, 1879.
- Pastor: *Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgange des Mittelalters*, 7 vols. 1886–1920. (English translation of German vols. 1–5, making 12 vols. ed. by Antrobus and Kerr).
- H. M. Baird: *The Rise of the Huguenots in France*. 1879.
- Baird: *The Huguenots and Henry of Navarre*. 1886.
- Georg Christian Bernhard Pünjer: *Geschichte der christlichen Religionsphilosophie seit der Reformation*. 2 Bände. 1880–3. (English translation of the first volume as, *History of the Christian Philosophy of Religion from the Reformation to Kant*, by W. Hastie. 1887).
- J. E. Thorold Rogers: *History of Agriculture and Prices in England*, vol. iv, 1882, pp. 72 ff.
- Rogers: *The Economic Interpretation of History*, 1888, pp. 83 ff.
- K. W. Nitzsch: *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Augsburger Religionsfriede*, hg. von Matthäi, 1883–5.
- Heinrich von Treitschke: "Luther und die deutsche Nation," 1883. (English translation in *Germany, France, Russia and Islam*, 1915, 227 ff. Other criticisms of the Reformation may be found in his other works, e.g., *Deutsche Geschichte im 19. Jahrhundert*, 1 Teil, 1895, pp. 86, 391).
- Charles Beard: *The Reformation of the Sixteenth Century in its relation to Modern Thought and Knowledge*. 1883.
- A. Stern: *Die Socialisten der Reformationszeit*. 1883.
- Matthew Arnold: *St. Paul and Protestantism*. 1883.
- Adolf (von) Harnack: *Martin Luther in seiner Bedeutung für die Geschichte der Wissenschaft und der Bildung*. 1883 (Fifth ed. 1910).
- Harnack: *M. Luther und die Grundlegung der Reformation*. 1917.
- Harnack: *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, Band iii, 1890. (Fourth ed. 1910, and English translation by Neil Buchanan, 1897).
- Harnack: *Das Wesen des Christentums*. 1900. (English translation *What is Christianity?* 1901).
- Harnack: "Die Bedeutung der Reformation innerhalb der

- allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte," *Reden und Aufsätze*, Band ii, Teil ii, 1904.
- Harnack: "Die Reformation," *Internationale Monatsschrift*, xi, 1917.
- M. Monnier: *La Réforme, de Luther à Shakespeare*. (Histoire de la littérature moderne). 1885.
- Leo Tolstoy: *Thoughts and Aphorisms*. 1886-93. Tolstoy's Works, English, 1905, xix, 137 f.
- Philip Schaff: *History of the Christian Church*. Vol. VI, The German Reformation. 1888. Vol. VII, The Swiss Reformation. 1892.
- F. von Bezold: *Die Reformation*. 1890. (In Oncken's Allgemeine Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen).
- F. von Bezold, E. Gotheim und R. Koser: *Staat und Gesellschaft der neueren Zeit*. 1908. (Die Kultur der Gegenwart, Teil ii, Abteilung V).
- William Cunningham: *Growth of English Industry and Commerce during the early and Middle Ages*. 1890. (Fourth ed. 1905).
- Cunningham: *Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times*. 1882. (3d ed. 1903).
- Cunningham: *Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects in Ancient Times*. 1898.
- Cunningham: *Western Civilization in its Economic Aspects in Modern Times*. 1900. (I also have the advantage of having taken notes of Dr. Cunningham's lectures at Columbia University, November, 1914).
- Rudolph Cristoph Eucken: *Die Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker*. 1890. (7th ed. 1907; English translation, *The Problem of Human Life*, by W. Hough and Boyce Gibson, 1909).
- F. Simmel: *Soziale Differenzierung*. 1890.
- Robert Flint: *History of the Philosophy of History*. 1893.
- C. Borgeaud: *The Rise of Modern Democracy in Old and New England*. Translated by Mrs. B. Hill. Preface by C. H. Firth. 1894. (First published in French periodicals 1890-1).
- Herbert L. Osgood: "The Political Ideas of the Puritans," *Political Science Quarterly*, vi, 1 ff., 201 ff., 1891.

- Wilhelm Dilthey: "Auffassung und Analyse des Menschen im 15. und 16. Jahrhundert." *Archiv für die Geschichte der Philosophie*, iv, (1891) 604 ff., v, (1892), 337 ff.
- Dilthey: "Die Glaubenslehre der Reformatoren," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, lxxv, (1894), pp. 44 ff.
- Dilthey: "Weltanschauung und Analyse des Menschen seit Renaissance und Reformation." *Gesammelte Schriften*, ii, 1914.
- E. A. Freeman: *Historical Essays*, 4th series, 1892.
- Karl Lamprecht: *Zum Verständnis der wirtschaftlichen und sozialen Wandlungen in Deutschland vom 14. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert*. 1893.
- Lamprecht: *Deutsche Geschichte*, Band 5, 1894-5.
- Otto Pfeiderer: *Philosophy and Development of Religion*. (Gifford Lectures at Edinburgh), 1894, vol. ii, pp. 321 ff.
- Pfeiderer: "Luther as the founder of Protestant civilization." In *Evolution and Theology*, 1900, pp. 48-79. (Address given 1883).
- E. Belfort Bax: *German Society at the Close of the Middle Ages*. 1894.
- Bax: *The Peasants' War in Germany*. 1899.
- Bax: *The Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists*. 1903. (Large portions of the three works by Bax have been reprinted in his *German Culture Past and Present*. 1915).
- Brooks Adams: *The Law of Civilization and Decay*. 1895.
- Brooks Adams: *The New Empire*. 1902.
- Karl Kautsky: *Vorläufer des neuen Sozialismus*, Band i, "Der Kommunismus in der deutschen Reformation," 1895. (Communism in Central Europe in the Time of the Reformation, transl. by J. L. and E. G. Mulliken. 1897).
- A. Berger: *Die Kulturaufgaben der Reformation*. 1895. (1908).
- Berger: *M. Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung*, 3 parts, 1895, 1907, 1919.
- Berger: *Ursachen und Ziele der deutschen Reformation*. 1899.
- Berger: *Sind Humanismus und Protestantismus gegensätzlich?* 1899.
- H. Hauser: "De l'humanisme et de la Réforme en France," *Revue Historique*, July-Aug. 1897.



- Karl Sell: "Die wissenschaftliche Aufgaben einer Geschichte der christlichen Religion," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, xcvi. (1899), 12 ff.
- Sell: *Christentum und Weltgeschichte seit der Reformation*. 1910.
- Sell: *Der Zusammenhang von Reformation und politischer Freiheit*. Abhandlungen in Theologischen Arbeiten aus dem rheinischen wissenschaftlichen Predigerverein. N. F. 12. 1910.
- John Mackinnon Robertson: *A Short History of Freethought*. 1899. (1915).
- Robertson: *A Short History of Christianity*. 1901. (1913).
- S. N. Patten: *The Development of English Thought. A Study in the Economic Interpretation of History*. 1899. (Fanciful).
- Ferdinand Brunetière: "L'oeuvre littéraire de Calvin." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Oct. 15, 1900.
- Brunetière: "L'oeuvre de Calvin." (1901). *Discours de Combat*, ii, 1908, pp. 121 ff.
- Williston Walker: *The Reformation*. 1900.
- Walker: *A History of the Christian Church*. 1918.
- A. Loisy: *L'Évangile et l'Église*. 1901. (Answer to Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums*).
- A. Lang: *History of Scotland*, i, 1901, p. 382.
- A. F. Pollard: *Henry VIII*. 1902.
- A. F. Pollard: *Thomas Cranmer*. 1904.
- Pollard: *Political History of England 1547-1603*. 1910.
- James Gairdner: *The English Church in the Sixteenth Century (1509-58)*. 1902.
- J. Gairdner: *Chapters in the Cambridge Modern History*, ii, 1902.
- Gairdner: *Lollardy and the Reformation*. 4 vols. 1908 ff.
- Mandell Creighton: *A History of the Papacy*, vol. 5, 1902.
- E. Armstrong: *The Emperor Charles V*. 1902.
- H. Lemonnier: *Histoire de France* (ed. par E. Lavis), v, 1903-4.
- James Harvey Robinson: "The Study of the Lutheran Revolt," *American Historical Review*, viii, 205. 1903.

- J. H. Robinson: "The Reformation," *Encyclopædia Britannica*, 1911.
- Auguste Sabatier: *Les religions d'autorité et la religion de l'esprit*. 1903. (1910. English translation 1904).
- (H. M.) Alfred Baudrillart: *L'Église catholique, la Renaissance, le Protestantisme*. 1904. (English translation by Mrs. Philip Gibbs. 1908).
- W. H. Frere: *The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, 1904.
- H. A. L. Fisher: *A Political History of England 1485-1547*. 1904.
- Fisher: *The Republican Tradition in Europe*, 1911, pp. 34 ff.
- J. H. Mariéjol: *Histoire de France* (ed. par E. Lavis), Tome vi, 1904.
- E. P. Cheyney: *The European Background of American History*, 1904, p. 168.
- O. Hegemann: *Luther in katholischem Urteil*. 1904.
- Friedrich Heinrich Suso Denifle: *Luther und Luthertum in der ersten Entwicklung*, i, 1904; ii, hg. von A. M. Weiss, 1909.
- Max Weber: "Die protestantische Ethik und der 'Geist' des Kapitalismus," *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, xx and xxi, 1905.
- George Santayana: *Reason in Religion*, 1905, pp. 114-124.
- Santayana: *Winds of Doctrine*. 1913, pp. 39-46.
- Santayana: *Egotism in German Philosophy*, 1917, pp. 1 ff., 23.
- P. Imbart de la Tour: *Les Origines de la Réforme*, 3 vols. 1905-13.
- P. Imbart de la Tour: "Luther et l'Allemagne," in *Revue de métaphysique et morale*, 1918, p. 611.
- David J. Hill: *A History of Diplomacy in the International Development of Europe*, vol. 2, 1906, pp. 422 f, 460.
- A. W. Benn: *A History of English Rationalism in the Eighteenth Century*, 1906, pp. 76 f.
- J. Mackinnon: *A History of Modern Liberty*, Vol. iii, *The Age of the Reformation*, 1906.
- T. M. Lindsay: *A History of the Reformation*. 2 vols. 1906-7.
- H. Böhmer: *Luther im Lichte der neueren Forschung*. 1906.

- (2d. ed. 1909, 3d 1913, 5th 1918, each much changed).
- Ernst Troeltsch: *Bedeutung des Protestantismus für die Entstehung der modernen Welt*. 1906. (2d ed. 1911; English translation, "Protestantism and Progress." 1912).
- Troeltsch: *Protestantisches Christentum und Kirche in der Neuzeit*, 1906. (Kultur der Gegenwart, I, Teil iv, 1). 2d ed. 1909.
- Troeltsch: "Protestantismus und Kultur," in *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1912.
- Troeltsch: *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, 1912.
- Troeltsch: "Renaissance und Reformation," *Historische Zeitschrift*, cx. 519 ff., 1913.
- Troeltsch: "Die Kulturbedeutung des Calvinismus," *Internationale Wochenschrift*, iv, 1910.
- Troeltsch: "Luther und der Protestantismus," *Neue Rundschau*, Oct. 1917.
- T. Brieger: "Die Reformation." In *Weltgeschichte 1500–1648*, ed. Pilgk-Harttung, 1907. (Published separately, enlarged, 1909).
- F. Loofs: *Luther's Stellung zum Mittelalter und zur Neuzeit*. 1907.
- Horst Stephan: *Luther in den Wandlungen seiner Kirche*. 1907.
- A. Kalthoff: *Das Zeitalter der Reformation*. 1907.
- Otto Pfeleiderer: *Die Entwicklung des Christentums*. 1907.
- Joseph Fabre: *La pensée moderne, de Luther à Leibnitz*. 1908.
- F. Lepp: *Schlagwörter des Reformationszeitalters*. 1908.
- Paul Sabatier: *Les Modernistes*, 1908 (Translated, *Modernism*, 1908, pp. 75 ff).
- Paul Sabatier: *L'Orientation religieuse de la France actuelle*, 1911. (Translated, *France Today, its Religious Orientation*, 1913, pp. 49–51).
- John Morley: *Miscellanies*. Fourth Series, 1908, pp. 120 ff.
- R. Eckert: *Luther im Urteil bedeutender Männer*. 1908. (2d ed., expanded, 1917).
- E. Boutroux: *Science et religion dans la philosophie contemporaine*, 1908, p. 13.

- L. Zscharnack: "Reformation und Humanismus im Urteil der deutschen Aufklärung," *Protestantische Monatshefte*, 1908, xii, 81 ff, 153 ff.
- F. Rachfahl: "Kalvinismus und Kapitalismus," *Internationale Wochenschrift*, iii, 1909.
- E. Fueter: "Die Weltgeschichtliche Bedeutung des Calvinismus." *Wissen und Leben*, ii, 1909, pp. 269 ff.
- E. Fueter: *Geschichte der neueren Historiographie*. 1911. (French translation, 1916).
- E. Fueter: *Geschichte des Europäischen Staatensystems 1492–1559*. 1919.
- W. Windelband: *Allgemeine Geschichte der Philosophie*, p. 395. (*Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil I, Abt. 5, 1909).
- Solamon Reinach: *Orpheus*, 1909.
- Jacob Salwyn Schapiro: *Social Reform and the Reformation*. 1909.
- F. Katzer: *Luther und Kant*. 1910.
- Emil Knodt: *Die Bedeutung Calvins und des Calvinismus für die protestantische Welt*. 1910.
- Jaeger: "Germanisierung des Christentums," *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1910.
- A. Dide: *J. J. Rousseau, le Protestantisme et la Révolution française*. (1910).
- J. Rivain: *Politique, Morale, Religion; Sur l'Esprit protestant; Protestantisme et progrès; l'Église et l'État*. 1910.
- C. Burdach: "Sinn und Ursprung der Worte Renaissance und Reformation." *Königliche-preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Sitzungsberichte*, 1910, pp. 594–646.
- W. Köhler: *Idee und Persönlichkeit in der Kirchengeschichte*. 1910.
- W. Köhler: "Luther," in *Morgenrot der Reformation*, hg. von Pflugk-Harttung, 1912.
- W. Köhler: *Martin Luther und die deutsche Reformation*. 1916.
- W. Köhler in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 1909. i, 2117 ff.
- Köhler: "Erasmus," 1918. (*Klassiker der Religion*).
- Köhler: *Dr. M. Luther, der deutsche Reformator*. 1917.

- H. T. Andrews: "The Social Principles and Effects of the Reformation." In *Christ and Civilization*, ed. J. B. Patten, Sir P. W. Bunting and A. E. Garvie, 1910.
- Fernand Mouret: *Histoire générale de l'Église*. Tome 5. La Renaissance et la Réforme. 1910. (1914).
- A. Humbert: *Les Origines de la Théologie moderne*, 1911.
- Hartmann Grisar: *Luther*. 3 vols. 1911-13.
- Preserved Smith: *Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, 1911. (Especially the preface to the second edition, 1914).
- Preserved Smith: "Justification by Faith," *Harvard Theological Review*, 1913.
- Preserved Smith: "Luther," *International Encyclopædia*, 1915.
- Preserved Smith: "The Reformation 1517-1917." *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Jan. 1918.
- Preserved Smith: "English Opinion of Luther," *Harvard Theological Review*, 1917.
- Hillaire Belloc: "The Results of the Reformation." *Catholic World*, Jan. 1912.
- P. Wernle: *Renaissance und Reformation*. 1912.
- Alfred Plummer: *The Continental Reformation*. 1912.
- Maxime Kowalewsky: *Die ökonomische Entwicklung Europas bis zum Beginn der kapitalistischen Wirtschaftsform*. Aus dem Russischen überstezt von A. Stein. Vol. vi, 1913, pp. 51 ff.
- J. B. Bury: *A History of Freedom of Thought*. 1913.
- G. L. Burr: "Anent the Middle Ages," *American Historical Review*, 1913.
- Burr: "The Freedom of History," *American Historical Review*, Jan. 1917.
- W. J. Ashley: *Economic Organization of England*, 1914, pp. 64 ff.
- A. Elkan: "Entstehung und Entwicklung des Begriffs 'Gegenreformation,'" *Historische Zeitschrift*, cxii, pp. 473-93, 1914.
- E. M. Hulme: *The Renaissance, the Protestant Revolution and the Catholic Reformation*. 1914. (Second ed. 1915).
- G. Wolf: *Quellenkunde der deutschen Reformationsgeschichte*, 2 vols. 1915, 1916.



- A. E. Harvey: "Economic Self-Interest in the German Anticlericalism of the 15th and 16th Centuries," *American Journal of Theology*, 1915.
- Harvey: "Economic Aspects of the Reformation," *Lutheran Survey*, Aug. 1, 1917, pp. 459-64.
- Harvey: "Martin Luther in the Estimate of Modern Historians," *American Journal of Theology*, July, 1918.
- W. P. Paterson: "Religion," chap. 9 of *German Culture*, ed. by W. P. Paterson, 1915.
- John Dewey: *German Philosophy and Politics*. 1915.
- H. Cohen: *Deutschtum und Judentum*. 1915.
- G. Kawerau: *Luther's Gedanken über den Krieg*. 1916.
- G. Monod: "La Réforme Catholique," *Revue Historique*, cxxi, 1916, esp. pp. 314 f.
- F. S. Marvin: *Progress and History*, 1916. (Essays by various authors).
- Shailer Mathews: *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*, 1916, esp. pp. 57 ff.
- Frank Puaux: "La Réformation jugée par Claude et Jurieu." *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme*, Juillet-Sept. 1917.
- L. Marchaud: *Le Réformation: ses causes, sa nature, ses conséquences*. 1917.
- N. Weiss: "Pour le Quatrième Centénaire de la Réformation," *Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du Protestantisme*, 1917, pp. 178 ff.
- K. D. Macmillan: *Protestantism in Germany*. 1917.
- Georg von Below: *Die Ursachen der Reformation*, 1917.
- H. M. Gwatkin: "Reformation," in *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, 1917.
- Alfred Fawkes: "Papacy," *ibid.*
- Max Lenz: "Luthers weltgeschichtliche Stellung," *Preussische Jahrbücher*, clxx, 1917.
- Chalfant Robinson: "Some Economic Aspects of the Protestant Reformation Doctrines." *Princeton Theological Review*, October 1917.
- Arthur Cushman McGiffert: "Luther and the Unfinished Reformation." Address given at Union Seminary Oct. 31, 1917, published in the *Union Seminary Bulletin*, 1918.

- Revue de Métaphysique et Morale*, Sept.-Dec., 1918. Special number on the Reformation with important articles by C. A. Bernouilli, Imbart de la Tour, N. Weiss, F. Buisson, F. Watson, Frederic Palmer, E. Doumergue and others.
- W. K. Boyd: "Political and Social Aspects of Luther's Message," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, Jan., 1918.
- H. Scholz: "Die Reformation und der deutsche Geist." *Preussische Jahrbücher*, clxx, 1, 1918.
- F. Heiler: *Luther's Religionsgeschichtliche Bedeutung*. 1918.
- F. J. Teggart: *The Processes of History*, 1918, pp. 162 ff.
- Lucy H. Humphrey: "French Estimates of Luther," *Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1918. (Interesting study).
- J. Paquier: *Luther et l'Allemagne*. 1918.
- Wilbur Cross Abbott: *The Expansion of Europe 1415-1789*. 2 vols. 1918.
- H. E. Barnes: "History," *Encyclopædia Americana*, 1919.
- George Foot Moore: *History of Religions: Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism*. 1919.
- P. Hume Brown: *Surveys of Scottish History*. 1919. (Essays posthumously collected).
- J. Haller: *Die Ursachen der Reformation*. 1919.
- F. Arnold: *Die deutsche Reformation in ihren Beziehungen zu den Kulturverhältnissen des Mittelalters*. 1919.
- D. H. Bauslin: *The Lutheran Movement of the Sixteenth Century*. 1919.

# Index

- Acton, Lord, 175, 228, 254, 255, 258
- Adrian VI, Pope, 201, 215, 228
- Alcala, University of, 110, 201
- America, 20, 21, 34, 75, 135, 197; town meeting, 137; first named on map, 153; religious liberty of, 182; rural schoolhouses, 192
- Anabaptists, and Bible, 117; communism of, 145; persecuted, 176-77, 178; for toleration, 178; judged by Bax, Kautsky, 245
- Anatomy, 150-51; and Leonardo da Vinci, 150; body tissue classified, 150-51; circulation of blood, 151
- Anne Boleyn, coronation, 97; and "Dr. Slanders," 130; and *Mona Lisa*, 204
- Antwerp, 17, 29, 32, 76, 77, 78, 83; fairs, 82, 84; guilds, 87; charity, 106; art, 209
- Aquinas, Thomas, 81, 132, 160, 174
- Architecture, decline of, 211; of cathedrals, 212; of university buildings, 192, 212-13; and Reformation influence, 213; baroque style, 213, 216; of dwellings, castles, palaces, 213; of cities, 214
- Ariosto, Lodvico, 49, 57; on marriage, 62; on women, 63, 64; on skeptics, 163; poetry, 217
- Aristotle, 67, 118, 132, 147, 149, 154, 160; and Bacon and Bruno, 159; reaction against, 170-71; and Luther, 171
- Art, 201-11; income of artists, 32; *Lives of Best Painters, Sculptors, and Architects*, by Vasari, 125; history and philosophy of, 125; ideals expressed, 201-04; painting, 202-07; sculpture, 207-08; etching, wood-carving, 210; and love of gruesome, and caricature, 211; as a "business" or "education," 215; effect of Reformation and Counter-Reformation, 215-16
- Ascham, Roger, 196-97, 199; on dress, 53; on drink, 54; on skeptics, 169; on vernacular romances, 217
- Astronomy, 153-59; Copernican theory, and reception of theory, 156-59
- Augsburg, 18, 73-74, 79; library at, 79; pauperism, 105; poor-relief, 107; religious peace of, 182
- Augustine, St., 126, 145, 174
- Bacon, Francis, 133, 147, 195, 218; on war, 45; on usury, 147; learning, 149; on Copernican theory, 159; on reason, 162; on skepticism, 169-70; on toleration, 182; on science, 198
- Beard, Charles, 257
- Berger, A. E., 247
- Beza, Theodore, 111, 128, 138, 179-80
- Bible, price of, 29; popularity of, 109, 116; various texts and translations of, by Erasmus, Luther, others, 112-16; illustrated by Raphael, 206
- Bodin, Jean, 125, 141; on debased currency, 147; and Copernican theory, 159; on religion, 165; on witchcraft, 187-88, 189-90
- Bologna, University of, 142, 150, 155, 163
- Bookkeeping, beginnings of, 72
- Books, prices of, 29-30; royalties from, 32; cheapness of, 49; Bible translations in use, 109-12; classics, variety and demand for, 118-19, 120-21; published in vernaculars, 122; estimated number in Germany, 216
- Bossuet, Jacques Benigne, 129; on Protestantism, 225-26; and Voltaire, 230; judged by Acton, 258
- Brantome, 125, 227

- Brigandage and violence, 59-60  
 Bruno, Giordano, 222; on polygamy, 62; and Copernicus, 159; on religion, 172-73  
 Buchanan, George, 123, 143, 226  
 Buckle, Henry Thomas, 242  
 Bullinger, Henry, 113, 129  
 Burnet, Gilbert, 129, 225
- Calendar, reform of, 159-60  
 Calvin, John, 133, 135, 137-38, 141, 143, 166, 248 (*see also* Calvinism); on torture, 40, and theaters, 44; biblical criticism, 114, 117; on usury, 147; and free thought, 161; on heretics, 178; on toleration, 179; and the devil, 184; and witchcraft, 186-87; and art, 215; on work and thrift, 248; and God, 262; judged by: Gibbon, 232-33; Christie, 250; Acton, 258  
 Calvinism, and "blue laws," 41; political theory, 135, 229; doctrines of, 232-33; and capitalism, 247-48, 264  
 Cambridge, University of, 144; salaries, 31; new colleges at, income of, 199; architecture, 212  
 Capitalism, 69-108; and Reformation, 69, 264; origins of, 70; banking, 72-75; mining, 75; commerce, 75-79; corporations, 79-82; trading ports, 82-86; manufacture and guilds, 86-91, agriculture, 91-96; and bourgeoisie, 97-99, 264; and professional classes, 99; and class wars, 100; and proletariat, 100-05; and pauperism, 105-08; and Marx, 244; and Lamprecht, 246-47; and Weber, 247; and Calvinism, 247-48  
 Cardan, Jerome, 148-49, 151-52  
 Carlyle, Thomas, 235, 239  
 Castiglione, Baldessare, on etiquette, 49-50, 57; on women, 64  
 Catharine de' Medici, 133; invents corset, 53; and art, 213; judged by Michelet, 238  
 Cellini, Benvenuto, 59, 125, 184, 213
- Charles V, Emperor, 29, 37, 80, 129; character, 54; portrait, 205  
 Chesterton, Gilbert Keith, 248  
 Children, treatment of, 65  
 Christie, Richard Copley, 250  
 Cicero, 46, 156, 165  
 Cities, description of, 52-53, 214  
 Clement VII, Pope, 44, 158, 215  
 Clergy, pay of, 31; numerical strength, 50, 51; morals of, 50-51; position and training of, 51; sermons, 51-52; spoliation, 98-99  
 Clocks and watches, invention of, 214  
 Cologne, University of, 199; and witchcraft, 186  
 Columbus, Christopher, 152, 265  
 Comte, Auguste, 242  
 Condorcet, Marie Jean, 235  
 Copernicus, Nicolaus, 147-49; Bible quoted against, 118; life, 154-57; astronomy, 155-57; publication and reception of theory, 156-59, 167; put on Index, 158-59; influence on philosophy, 171, 265; judged by Bruno, 159  
 Counter-reformation, 214-16, 242
- Darwin, Charles, 118, 149, 157; *Origin of Species*, 244  
 Demonology, 184-85  
 Dilthey, William, 249  
 Divorce, 61  
 Dress, regulation of, 42-43; description of, 53  
 Drinking, 43-44, 54  
 Duelling, 44  
 Dürer, Albert, 17, 28, 30, 32, 87, 210; income, 32; art, 209-11; and Reformation, 210  
 Dwellings, description of, 53
- Education, method, 192-93, 196-97; curriculum, 193-94, 195-96, 197, 200; and Reformation, 194-95, 198  
 Edward VI, of England, 42, 197; and guilds, 90; and Bible, 116; and schools, 195  
 Elizabeth I, of England, 37, 38, 41, 48-49, 78, 116, 197; dancing, 56, and liberty, 144; and skepticism,

- 168-69; tolerance, 182; and universities, 199; and art, 213; and Spenser, 217; judged by Acton, 258
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo, 239
- England, 17, 21, 34, 37-39, 75, 78, 83, 84, 86, 96, 101, 137, 143, 145; prices, staples, 26-28; wages, 30; navy, 31, 47-49; criminal law, 41; wine regulation, 44; army, 47; clergy, 51; inns, 55; morals, 59; brigandage, 60; guilds, 90-91; agriculture, 91-93; social revolution, 98-99; serfs, 100; poor-relief, 107-08; and Vergil's *English History*, 124-25; chronicles, 125; and Reformation, 135, 229, 230; skeptics, 168-69; Catholic toleration, 182; witchcraft, 186-88; schools, 192, 195; universities, 199-200; and poetry, 218; leadership, 255; judged by Froude, 238
- Entertainment, popular, "bath-parties," 56; teasing lunatics, 68
- Erasmus, 45-46, 60, 104, 112-13, 119, 125, 126, 133-34, 140, 179, 181, 196, 200, 210, 251; income, 32; on German inns, 55; anecdote, 58; on polygamy, 62; on treatment of women, 63; edits New Testament, 109-10; on love of books, 120-21; on Latin style, 121; on persecution, 175, 178-79; and witchcraft, 186; on education, 196, 197; as university professor, 201; portrait, 209; on hymn-singing, 215; wit, 218
- Eucken, Rudolf, 257
- Fairs, trading at, 76, 82, 84-85
- Faust, fable of, and Luther, 220-21
- Ferrara, University of, 155, 163
- Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 239
- Florence, 19, 25-26, 73; hospitals, 68; architecture, 212
- Food, variety of, 53-54
- Foxe, John, 128, 224-25
- France, 18, 21, 22, 24-25, 60, 78, 96, 99, 137, 235; prices, staples, 27, 28; real estate, 29; wages, 30, 31; wine trade, 44; Estates General, 37-38; duelling, 44; inns, 55; serfs, 100; poor-relief, 107; persecution, 137, 165; republicans, 138; skeptics, 164; toleration, 182; universities, 198, 200; Revolution, 235
- Francis I, of France, 22, 23, 29, 31, 47; on gambling, 43; and Collège de France, 200; portrait, 205; and art, 213
- Froude, James Anthony, 235, 238, 247
- Fugger, banking family, 23, 39, 73-74, 75, 79
- Galileo, 157, 159, 239
- Gambling, 43
- Games (cards, chess, dice), 56
- Geneva, 197; dancing, 56; witchcraft, 186-87, 188; university at, 200
- Genoa, 19, 29, 73, 77
- Geography, 152-53; size of earth estimated, 152; maps, 153
- Germany, 17-18, 21, 25, 28-29, 37, 60, 75, 78-79, 92, 102, 134, 135, 136, 160, 183; prices, staples, 26-27; wages, 30; inns, 55; prostitution, 61; serfs, 100; poor-relief, 107; skeptics, 163-64; witch hunt, 188; schools, 194-95; universities, 198-99; books, 216; leadership, 255
- Gibbon, Edward, 232-33
- Gilds, 87-91
- Gipsies, 105
- Goethe, 162, 221, 233-34
- Greek classics, 118-19; grammar, 119; teaching of, 196
- Guizot, Francois, 236
- Harnack, Adolph von, 256
- Hebrew, grammar, 119; teaching of, 197, 200
- Hegel, 240-41, 242, 246
- Heine, 235, 237
- Henry VIII, of England, 23, 32, 37, 38, 40, 41, 78, 79, 144; introduces military uniforms, 46; halts brigandage, 60; and horsebreeding, 92; and *English History*, 124; and "Dr. Slanders," 130; and education, 195; portrait, 209; divorced, 227, 230;



- abbey lands confiscated, 229;  
 judged by Acton, 258  
 Herder, Johann, 239  
 Historiography, in 16th century,  
 122-30; humanistic, 122-25;  
 memoirs, chronicles, biography,  
 125; church history, 126-30  
 Hobbes, Thomas, 135  
 Holbein, Hans, 96-97, 205, 209,  
 211  
 Hospitals, conditions in, 68  
 Hotman, Francis, 125, 138-39  
 Huguenots, and Machiavelli, 133;  
 politics, 227; caricatured, 211;  
 and Meyerbeer's opera, "The  
 Huguenots," 236; judged by:  
 French secular historians, 227;  
 Michelet, 237-38  
 Hume, David, 231-32  
 Huss, John, 261  
 Huxley, Thomas H., 248-49  
 Imports and exports, Portuguese,  
 76-77; Spanish, English, Italian,  
 French, 78  
 Index (Catholic) Prohibited  
 Books, 133, 158-59, 189  
 Inquisition, 173; on virginity, 62;  
 and books on anatomy, 151; and  
 philosophy, 163; and witchcraft,  
 186, 188; judged by: modern  
 Catholics, 175-76; Froude, 238  
 Insurance, beginnings of, 82  
 Italy, 18-19, 21, 25, 160; hospitals,  
 68; bookkeeping, 72; banking  
 techniques, 73; skepticism, 163  
 James, William, 128, 150, 257  
 Janssen, Johannes, 257  
 Jesuits, casuistry, 61; and tyran-  
 nicide, 144; and philosophy, 163;  
 schools and colleges, 195-96,  
 199; art, 216; psychology, 258;  
 judged by Michelet, 238  
 Jovius, Paul, 124-25, 226  
 Justification by faith, doctrine of,  
 243; Luther's contribution to,  
 115; and Reformers, 161; his-  
 torical estimate of, 262-63;  
 judged by: Paquier, 255; Loisy,  
 256; Preserved Smith, 262-63  
 Kant, Immanuel, 160, 237, 255  
 Kepler, Johann, 222, 239  
 Knox, John, 123, 142, 143; on  
 women, 63-64; as historian, 128-  
 29; judged by Acton, 258  
 Lagarde, Paul Anton de, 254  
 Lamprecht, Karl, 246-47  
 Latin, importance of, 15, 120-21;  
 classics, 118-22; love of, 120;  
 literary style of, 121; and sci-  
 ence, 121-22; grammar, 119;  
 teaching of, 192-94  
 Laveleye, Emile de, 255  
 Law and order, maintenance of,  
 40-41; "blue laws," 41-44  
 Lecky, William, 243  
 Lefèvre, biblical work, 111, 115;  
 as university professor, 201  
 Leo X, Pope, 201, 205, 206, 213  
 Leonardo da Vinci, income, 32;  
 and anatomy, physics, astron-  
 omy, 150-51, 154; on authority,  
 171; scientific work, 172, 202;  
 on necromancy, 189; art, 202-  
 04, 205, 208, 209; character  
 studies, 202; self-portrait, 202-  
 03; *Last Supper*, 203; *Mona  
 Lisa* and critics, 203; *Mona  
 Lisa* judged by Preserved Smith,  
 203-04  
 Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, 234  
 Literary work, income from, 32  
 Literature, Bible, doctrinal use of,  
 109; classics, revered, 118;  
 poetry, love of, 121, 217-18;  
 Latin literary style, 121; taste  
 in, 216-17; wit, humor, satire,  
 218-19  
 Loisy, Alfred Firmin, 256, 259  
 London, 17, 29, 65, 77, 85, 89, 98;  
 theater, 44; brothels, 61; fairs  
 at, 84; pauperism in, 105; Col-  
 lege of Physicians founded, 200  
 Louvain, University of, 196, 200  
 Loyola, Ignatius, autobiography,  
 130; joylessness, 217; judged by  
 Lagarde, 254  
 Lunatics, treatment of, 67-68  
 Luther, Martin (*see also* Luther-  
 anism), career and writings:  
 194, 202; income and real es-  
 tate, 29, 31, 32; anecdotes, as  
 clergyman, 52, 123; *Table Talk*,  
 53, 62, 157; closes brothels, 61;

- visits Florence hospital, 68; *Address to the German Nobility*, 81, 106-07; as Bible translator, 114-15; *Treatise on Civil Authority*, 136; as professor, 201; as hymn-writer, 214, 255; as Reformation writer, 255; at Diet of Worms, 258
- Luther, Martin, opinions, doctrines, and character: 183, 262-63; on theaters, 44; on war, 45; on hunting, 56; on dancing and parties, 56; composes scurrilous verses, 58; on Reformation morals, 59; on lying, on chastity, 59; on polygamy, 62, 226; on marriage, 62, 64; on treatment of children, 65; commercial ideas, 81, 82, 147; on usury, 81, 147; political theory, 97, 135-37, 145; on Peasants' War, 104, 135; on poor-relief, 106-07; biblical criticism, 113-15, 117, 118; refutes Koran, 126; and social reform, 135; on Copernican theory, 157-58; as philosopher, 160, 161; on Aristotle, 171; on toleration, 175, 176, 177; and the devil, 184; on witchcraft, 186; on education, 194-95, 196; and church architecture, 213; on music and art, 215; and word "Reformation," 224; on work, 248, 264; on role of Protestant clergymen, 264; on Christ and Bible, 265
- Luther, Martin, influence and relations with contemporaries: and Murner, 32, 218; and Lemnius, 58; and English skeptics, 169; and Castellio, 179; and Erasmus, 181; and Raphael, 205-06; and Dürer, 211; caricatured, 211; popularizes music, 215; and Faust legend, 221; general influence, 222; his "gospel," 224, 261; as great liberator, 235
- Luther, Martin, and Reformation, judged by: Crespin, Beza, 128; John Foxe, 128, 224-25; Knox, 128-29; Bullinger, Sleiden, 129; Nicholas Sanders, Cochlaeus, 130, 225; Mathesius, 130; Bonaventure des Periers, 164; Montaigne, 166-67; Peter Charron, 167-68; Bruno, 173; Richard Burton, 224; Seckendorf, Peter Martyr d' Aughierra, 225; Bossuet, 225-26; Vettori, Guicciardini, Brantome, 227; Voltaire, 230; William Robertson, 231, 234; Hume, 232; Gibbon, 232-33; Wieland, 233; Goethe, 233-34; German Protestants, early orthodoxy and later liberalism, 234; Mosheim, Schmidt, Lessing, 234; Dollinger, 235, 243; Heine, 235, 237; Michelet, 235, 237-38; Carlyle, 235, 239; Froude, 235, 238, 247; French Revolution, 235; Condorcet, 235; Charles de Villers, 235-36; Guizot, Werner, 236; Romantic Movement, 236; Madame de Stael, 236; obscurantists, Jesuits, Catharine de' Medici, Macaulay, Quinet, Thierry, Herbert Spencer, Motley, Prescott, 238; Emerson, Herder, Arndt, Fichte, D. F. Strauss, 239; Hegel, 240-41; Ferdinand Christian Baur, 241; Ranke, 241-42; Buckle, 242-43; Henry Hallam, Lecky, Ritschl, Merle d' Aubigne, 243; Belfort Bax, 245; Lamprecht, 246-47; A. E. Berger, Max Weber, Thorold Rogers, 247; Chesterton, 248; Huxley, 248-49; Tolstoy, Symonds, William Dilthey, 249; Nietzsche, 249-50; R. C. Christie, Andrew D. White, J. M. Robertson, Henry C. Lea, Bezold, George L. Burr, Lemonnier, J. Burckhardt, 250; Troeltsch, 251-52; Santayana, 252-53; G. Monod, H. A. L. Fisher, Russell, Salomon Reinach, 253; Imbart de la Tour, 253-54; Paul Legarde, 254; Treitschke, 254, 259; Waitz, Kurtz, Karl Sell, 254; Gustav Kawerau, 254-55; Emile de La-veleye, 255; Paul Sabatier, 255, 259; Denys Cochin, 255;

- Paquier, 255-56; Weiss, Harnack, 256; Loisy, 256, 259; Protestant scholars, 256; Laurent, 256-57; Beard, Eucken, William James, Maurenbrecher, Gasquet, Janssen, 257; Pastor, 259-58; Denifle, Grisar, Lord Acton, 258; Renan, Neville Figgis, A. F. Pollard, Mackinnon, A. W. Benn, E. P. Cheyney, C. Borgeaud, H. L. Osgood, Woodrow Wilson, J. H. Robinson, 259; Preserved Smith, 260-66
- Lutheranism, and "blue laws," 41; political theory, 135, 229; and free thinkers, 162; alliance with Catholics, 176-77; doctrines of, 232-33
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington, 228, 238
- Machiavelli, Nicolo, 45, 46, 47, 97, 131-33, 139, 141-42, 146; ethics, 60; on classics, 120; as historian, 123; *The Prince*, 123, 131, 133; and Christianity, 163, 181; as skeptic, 165; judged by: Catharine de' Medici, Thomas Cromwell, Bacon, 133; Mornay, 139; Bodin, 141; Neville Figgis, 259
- Manners, and Castiglione, 49-50; courtesy, extent of, 56-57; Prince Charming ideal, 57; anecdotes, 57-58
- Marlowe, Christopher, 169, 221
- Marot, Clement, 218
- Marriage, praised, 62-63; trial marriage (Scotland), 62; child-marriage, 65
- Marx, Karl, 244, 246
- Mary Stuart, Queen of Scots, 123, 142-43; dress, 28; judged by: Knox, John Craig, 142-43; Acton, 258
- Mathematics, 148-49; perfection of symbolism, 148; algebraic notation, 148; trigonometry, 148-49; "symbolic logic," 149
- Medicine and health, public sanitation, 44-45; longevity, 65; death-rate in Elizabethan London, 65; bubonic plague, tuberculosis, smallpox, venereal diseases, 66; science and art of medicine, state of, 67; and theory of Paracelsus, 67, 167, 172; surgery, obstetrics, 67; lunatics, treatment of, 67-68; 16th century hospitals, 68
- Melanchthon, Philipp, 104, 114, 137, 158; salary, 31; as dancer, 56; and scurrilous epigrams, 58; persecutes, 177; on education, 196; as university professor, 201
- Michelangelo, income, 32; art, 207-09; and St. Peter's, 212; *Last Judgment* desecrated, 215
- Michelet, Jules, 235, 237-38
- Milton, John, 146, 154, 228
- Money, value of in 16th century, 23-25, 33; coins, 24-26; interest on, 28-29, 72, 81, 147; public finance, management of, 39; power of, 96
- Montaigne, Michel de, 139-40, 166; on torture, 41; on classics, 120, 121; philosophy, 166-67; on toleration, 180; on witchcraft, 190-91
- Montesquieu, Charles Lewis, 229, 231
- Morals, of clergy, 50-51; of laymen, 58-59; and Reformation, 59
- More, Sir Thomas, 54, 56, 116, 133; marriages and home life, 63; *Utopia*, 63, 104-05, 145-46, 180, 181, 222; on Bible criticism, 113; and religion, 168, 181; on persecution, 180; and witchcraft, 186; judged by Robertson, 250
- Mornay, Philippe de, 139
- Music, musical instruments, melodies, hymns, composers, 214; and Luther, 215; psalm-singing, 215
- Navigation, improvement of, 159
- Netherlands, 17, 21, 28, 30, 32, 46, 60, 82-83, 87, 95, 138, 142, 160; prices, staples, 28; establishes post offices, 44; serfs, 100; poor-relief, 105; toleration, 182;

- school, Deventer, 192; universities, 200-01
- Nietzsche, 233, 248, 249-50, 255
- Nobility, position of, 49-50
- Nuremberg, 18, 32, 42, 79, 80, 210; poor-relief, 107; "godless painters" of, 163-64; watches invented at, 214
- Oxford, University of, 173; salaries, 31; new colleges and attendance at, 199; architecture of, 212
- Padua, University of, 155, 163
- Palestrina, music of, 214
- Paris, 18, 29, 41, 89, 107; tennis courts, 56; brothels, 61; hospitals, 68
- Paris, University of (Sorbonne), 111, 140, 171; and poor-relief plan, 107; and heretics, 175; and Latin-speaking students, 194; largest university, 200; architecture at, 212
- Pastor, Ludwig von, 257-58
- Paul III, Pope, 31-32, 201; and artists, 32, 59; and Copernicus, 156, 158, and philosophy, 163
- Philip II, of Spain, and Elizabethan England, 84; judged by Acton, 258
- Philosophy, 160-73
- Physics, 151-52; and Leonardo da Vinci, 151; optics, 151; lever and pulley explained, 152; magnetism and compass, 152
- Pilgrimages, 55
- Plato, 118, 126, 145, 160
- Plutarch, 118-19, 120, 156
- Poland, 21, 160; guilds; toleration, 182
- Political theory, 130-47; national state, 131-33; republicanism, 133-35; separation of church and state, 135; bureaucratic government, 135-36; constitutional government, 136-43; tyrannicide, 143-45; radical, 145-46; and economics, 146-47
- Polygamy, 61-62, 118, 226
- Pomponazzi, Peter, 163, 181
- Popular assemblies, 37
- Population in 16th century Europe, fluctuations in, 16; statistics and estimates of, 16-21; families, size of, 64-65
- Portugal, 20, 47, 76-78, 85-86, 160
- Post Offices, establishment of, 44
- Prices, 26-30; wheat, 26-27; animals, 27; groceries, 27-28; dry-goods, 28; metals, 28; real estate, 29; books, 29-30; rise of, 33-34, 70, 103, 147
- Professions, new role of, 50
- Prostitution, 61
- Ptolemy, 118, 153*n*, 154
- Puritans, 41-42, 44, 143, 215, 217
- Quinet, Edgar, 238
- Rabelais, François, received benefice, 32; on anarchy, 145; philosophy, 164; defines God, 164; love of life, 165, 218; judged by Bacon, 218
- Ranke, Leopold von, 241-42, 246
- Raphael Sanzio, 49, 205-06; wealth, 32; as painter, 205-07, 208; and St. Peter's, 212; judged by posterity, 206-07
- Reformation, 123, 239; morals during, 59; and prostitution, 61; and capitalism, 69, 81, 264; and poor-relief, 107; historiography of, 128-30; and separation of church and state, 135, 137; tolerance during, 181; and Renaissance, 181, 248-49, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 264-65; and culture and education, 194; and universities, 198, and art, 210, 215; and caricatures, 198; and Counter-reformation, 215-26, 242; and books, 216; other historical movements compared with, 229, 230, 261; and Mendelssohn's "Reformation Symphony," 236; and Kaulbach's painting, "Age of the Reformation," 236; from external to internal, 247, 262; political and economic changes, 263-64
- Reformation, various interpretations: 223-59; Protestant, 223-25; 243, 256-57, 259; Catholic,

- 225-26, 257-59; political, 226-29; rationalist, 229-34, 243; liberal, 235-36, 259; romantic, 236-37; 19th century historians, 237-39; scientific, 239-43; economic, 244-48; Darwinian, 248-50; 20th century scholars, 250-59
- Reformation, causes of, various opinions: Nicholas Sanders, 130, 225; Luther, 224; John Foxe, 224-25; Burnet, 225; Bossuet, 225-26; Paul Jovius, Polydore Vergil, 226; secular historians, 227; Vettori, Guicciardini, Martin Du Bellay, Hugo Grotius, 227; Paul Sarpi, 228-29; Harrington, 229; humanists, 229; Montesquieu, 229-30; Voltaire, 230-31; William Robertson, 231, Hume, 231-32; Hegel, 240; Ferdinand Christian Baur, 241; Ranke, Buckle, 242; Belfort Bax, Karl Kautsky, 245; S. N. Patten, Brooks Adams, Friedrich Simmel, Lamprecht, 246; A. E. Berger, 247; Pastor, 257-58; Denifle, Lord Acton, 258; A. F. Pollard, 259; Preserved Smith, 260, 261-62; *see also* Martin, Luther
- Relief for poor, secular, at Lille, Bruges, Antwerp, Ypres, 106; at Wittenberg, Augsburg, Nuremberg, 107; condemned by Catholics, 107; scattered approval for, 107; workhouses in England, 107-08
- Renaissance and Reformation, 181, 249, 250, 251, 253, 257, 260, 264
- Renan, Ernest, 259
- Robertson, William, 231
- Rome, 19, 40, 59, 155; pilgrimages to, 55; prostitutes, 61; St. Peter's, 212; wit and humor, 218; university of, 201
- Russell, Bertrand, 253
- Russia, 85, 99, 160, 264
- Sabatier, Paul, 255, 259
- Sadolet, Jacopo, 111, 250
- Santayana, George, 250, 252-53
- Sarpi, Paul, 228-29, 230
- Savonarola, 124, 181
- Schools, 194-95; salaries, 31; endowed, 192; village, as at Mansfield, 192; teachers, 192-93; studies, mainly Latin, 193-94; in Germany, England, Scotland, 195; Jesuit, 195-96; and educational reformers, 196; teaching methods, 196-97; Greek and Hebrew studied, 197
- Science, inductive method, 147; *see also* Anatomy; Astronomy; Geography; Mathematics; Physics; Zoology
- Scotland, 17, 21, 85, 142-43; theater, duelling, swearing, Sabbath-keeping, 44; brigandage, 60; trial marriage, 62; serfdom, 100; pauperism, 137; schools, 195; Edinburgh University, 199
- Seckendorf, Veit Ludwig von, 129, 225
- Servetus, Michael, 151, 162, 178
- Shakespeare, 124, 207, 218
- Slaves and slave-trading, 77, 84
- Sleiden, Johann, 126, 129-30; 228
- Spain, 19-20, 21, 25, 37, 39, 46, 47-48, 74-75, 77, 94, 97, 98, 100, 160, 181; clergy, 51; brigandage, 60; universities, 201; judged by Froude, 238
- Spencer, Herbert, 238
- Spenser, Edmund, 217
- Sports (bear-baiting, bull baiting, hunting, tennis), 56
- Stael, Madame de, 236
- Strassburg, 26, 79; brothels, 61; persecutes heretics, 177; St. Vitus' dance at, 188; artistic clock at, 213-14
- Strauss, David Friedrich, 239
- Sumptuary laws, purpose of, 41-43
- Switzerland, 117, 230; republicanism, 137; persecutes Anabaptists, 177-78; universities, 200
- Symonds, John Addington, 249
- Tasso, 163, 217
- Taxation, 39, 101
- Theatre and drama, 44, 56, 219-21
- Thierry, Jacques, 238
- Titian, 204, 205, 206, 208, 222
- Tobacco, use of, 54



- Tolerance and intolerance, 174-82;  
and Bible, 117-18; of Catholics,  
174-76; of Protestants, 176-80;  
and Reformation, 181-82, 252,  
265
- Tolstoy, Leo, 249
- Travel, conditions of, 55
- Treitschke, Heinrich von, 254, 259
- Troeltsch, Ernst, 250-52
- Tyndale, William, 115-16, 137
- Udal, Nicholas, salary at Eton, 31;  
best "flogging teacher," 193
- Universities, 197-99; professors'  
salaries, 31-32; age of students,  
197; conditions at, 197; instruc-  
tion and degrees at, 198; in  
Germany, 198, 199; in Scotland,  
Ireland, 199; in England, 199-  
200; in Switzerland, and courses  
at Geneva, 200; in France, 200;  
in Netherlands, 200-01; in Spain,  
Italy, 201; contributions of, 201;  
*see also* universities by name
- Usury, 29, 81, 147
- Vasari, George, 125, 203, 206
- Venice, 19, 25, 75, 77, 85; bubonic  
plague in, 66; Inquisition in,  
188; art, 204
- Vergil, Polydore, 124-25, 226
- Vives, Lewis, 145, 147; on poor-  
relief, 106; as social reformer,  
118; on experimentation, 171;  
on education, 196
- Voltaire, on astronomy, 154; on  
religion, 229; on Reformation,  
230-31
- Wages and salaries, 30-32, 103
- Wealth, increase of, in 16th cen-  
tury and in modern times, 21-23
- Weber, Max, on "Capitalism and  
Calvinism," judged by: Knodt,  
Cunningham, Brentano, Kova-  
lewsky, Ashley, Chesterton, 248
- Wilson, Woodrow, 259
- Witchcraft, 182-91; causes of, 182-  
84; the witch, 184; the devil,  
184-85; Witches' Sabbath, 185;  
and Inquisition, 186; and Prot-  
estantism, 186-87; witch hunt,  
187-88; profits to magistrates,  
188; growing skepticism, 188-91
- Wittenberg, 23, 26, 107, 186; Uni-  
versity of, 112, 156, 173, 198,  
220-21; salaries, 31; clergymen  
at, 51; and scurrilous epigrams,  
58; debate on women, 64; and  
Copernican theory, 157, 158;  
Luther as professor at, 224
- Women, position of, 63; debate on,  
64; chivalry toward, 64
- Wyclif, John, and Reformation,  
261; translates Bible, 115-16
- Zoology, 149-50; and Conrad  
Gesner's *History of Animals*,  
149-50
- Zurich, dancing prohibited, 56;  
brothels, 61; and Anabaptists,  
177; University of, 200
- Zwingli, Huldreich, 177, 200; as  
Bible critic, 114; on usury, 147;  
on reason, 162; judged by:  
Bossuet, 226; Voltaire, 230;  
Gibbon, 232-33; Acton, 258



# The Sights, Sounds and Feelings of the 16th Century

In *The Social Background of the Reformation*, the quixotism, the wealth and poverty, the noisome mass of life in the sixteenth century are vividly re-created in this volume. With it, the modern reader can gain a realistic understanding of the world that produced the Reformation.

"Admirably arranged. The interpretation of all the principal movements of the period is intelligent, liberal, and convincing, and entitles the author to be ranked with the best authorities upon the period in this and in every other country."

—*American Historical Review*

"The author is well equipped with knowledge of the period, and writes with clearness and vivacity. In fine, Mr. Smith's work, in the way of historical narration and the conveyance of general information, seems to cover his period in an unexceptionable manner."

—Henry Osborn Taylor

Preserved Smith was one of America's great teachers of history—at Williams, Amherst, Harvard, and Cornell—until his death in 1941. His major books include *A History of Modern Culture* (available in a two-volume Collier Books paperback edition as *The Origins of Modern Culture and The Enlightenment*), *Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, and *Erasmus: A Study of His Life, Ideas and Place in History*.



**COLLIER BOOKS** AMERICA'S LARGEST PUBLISHER OF PAPERBACK TITLES

PRINTED IN U. S. A.